School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1375712

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

THIS OLD HOUSE · BOOKS
5399 HOLT AVE.
MONTCLAIR, CALIF.

AN AID
TO THE TEXTUAL AMENDMENT
OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

AN AID
TO THE TEXTUAL AMENDMENT
OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

BS
1185
K5

BY

JAMES KENNEDY, D. D.

EDITED BY

N. LEVISON, B. D.

Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street
1928

Printed in Palestine by
R. H. COHEN'S Press, JERUSALEM

for

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH
LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, Ltd.
NEW-YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Table of Alphabets — — — — — — — —	Frontispiece
Editorial Note — — — — — — — — —	VII–IX
Introductory Remarks on the Necessity for the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures — —	1–3

PART I.

VARIOUS POSSIBILITIES OF DEPARTURE FROM THE ORIGINAL TEXT.

1. Absence of Vowel-signs in ancient Hebrew — —	4–7
2. Want of Uniformity in the Employment of the Vowel-letters	7–10
3. Interchange of Vowel-letters — — — — —	10–12
4. Substitution of similarly sounded Consonants other than Vowel-letters — — — — — — —	12–31
5. Cases in which Substitution of more than one Letter has occurred — — — — — — — —	31–34
6. Errors due to Substitution of Letters similar in Form	34–113
7. Substitution of more than one similar Letter — —	113–121
8. Transposition of Letters in Transcription.	
a) Internal Metathesis of Letters (Anagrams)	121–125
b) External Transposition — — — —	125–127
c) Attachment of Words in wrong Positions	127–131
9. Omissions From the Massoretic Text.	
A. Omissions of single Letters — — — —	132–133
a) Posterior Haplography — — — —	133–135
b) Anterior Haplography — — — —	135–137
c) Letters omitted which are different from others adjacent — — — — — —	137
d) Omission of single Letters — — —	137–139
B. Omission of single Words — — — —	139–142
a) Weak Consonants specially liable to Omission	142–144
b) Omission of Words causing Difficulty —	144–149
C. Omission of two or more Words — — —	149–150

10. Additions to the Original Hebrew Text — — — 150–151
a) Posterior Dittograms — — — — 151–155
b) Anterior Dittograms — — — — 155–156
c) Anterior Dittograms of more than one Letter 156–157
d) Repetition of whole Words — — — 157–158
e) Conflate Readings — — — — — 158–163
f) Explanatory Notes, or Glosses — — 163–165
11. Fusion of Forms — — — — — — — 165–168
12. Diatomy — — — — — — — — — 168–169
13. Assimilation of Contiguous Resemblants — — — 169–172
14. Abbreviations as Causes of Error in Transcription — 172–174
15. Complicated Cases — — — — — — — 174–181
16. Substitution of Synonymous Terms — — — — 181–187

PART II.

MEANS AVAILABLE FOR DISCOVERING MORE REASONABLE READINGS.

17. Massoretic Notes — — — — — — — — 189–190
18. Sebîrîn — — — — — — — — — 190–191
19. The Note-line — — — — — — — — 191–193
20. The Context as a Guide in correcting the Text — 193–202
21. Deuterographs as Aids in discovering Deviations from the original Text — — — — — — 202–208
22. Parallelism as a Guide to Emendation — — — 209–215
23. Alphabetical Poems as a Guide in Emendation — 215–219
24. Ancient Versions as Helps— — — — — — 219–229
25. Conclusion — — — — — — — — — 229–231
Index of Authors and Books — — — — — — 233–234
Index of Scripture References. — — — — — 235–250
Errata — — — — — — — — — — 251–255

EDITORIAL NOTE.

The dictum of the Psalmist, "But his delight was in the Torah of Yaveh, and in his Torah did he muse day and night". (Ps. 1/2) may be literally applied to the author of this book, for nothing gave him greater happiness than the study of the Bible.

Dr. Kennedy was very conservative theologically, and it may be that this very conservatism led him to such seeming liberalism in dealing with the text. He was possessed with an intense passion for the correction of the Massoretic Text, and, as will be seen from the contents of this book, it was no mere speculation but considered and conscientious study that led him to his conclusions.

The contents of this book are the result of 30 years labour. It was my good fortune to gain the friendship of Dr. and Mrs. Kennedy over 20 years ago, and, whether at the weekly meetings (in their home in Edinburgh) or in the letters which followed me to the burning plains of India or the snow-clad Canadian Rockies, the main theme of the discussion was the emendation of the text, so that the material contained in this book is not new to me.

Dr. Kennedy was one of those men to whom duty was no mere empty idea. Whether it was his duty towards God, his church, or the ordering of his daily life, it was performed to its full extent as far as humanly possible. Hence in spite of his attachment to the study of the Massoretic Text, he believed it his duty to undertake another work which few were willing or able to do, namely, the enlargement of the "Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature". Still he hoped to see this work, too, through the press.

In 1921 it became evident to him that he could not carry on the two tasks simultaneously, and he asked me if I would see this work through the press. The stress of other work prevented me at that time from acceding to his request. In 1923 when lecturing to the "Old Testament Society of Great Britain" in Birmingham, he met

with an accident which impaired his health and made it quite impossible for him to continue his work. He again appealed to me to undertake the publication of the book, but I again found myself unable to do so. I promised him to undertake it as soon as possible. His death in 1925 left me no choice but to go on with the work. As Mrs. Kennedy came to live with us after Dr. Kennedy's death, I had hoped with her assistance to complete my task, but unhappily for me she did not long survive her true life companion. Being deprived of her help I sought that of some members of the "Old Testament Society of Great Britain", but could not obtain it. Under these circumstances I have done my best to include in the book the most mature results of his labours.

While there are a number of emendations with which I do not personally agree, and which I feel others will not readily accept, I must point out that these were arrived at after very searching tests of the text and ought to be studied very carefully.

It is not for me to estimate the value of the work contained in these pages, but I must draw the attention of O. T. scholars to the emendations which are made on the supposition that the faulty readings in the Massoretic Text are due to interchange of letters in cognate semitic alphabets. These emendations are too numerous to be accidental, and many of them are inexplicable save on the basis offered in the text of this book. If these emendations be admitted and the reasons offered as to the nature of their corruption be granted, further investigation on these lines may result in a solution of the sources of O. T. narratives. For instance if we find a certain book, section, or in the case of the Psalms a chapter in which the corruptions may be traced mainly to the mistaken interchange of letters of the Egyptian Aramaic or Palmyrene, we could say with confidence that the origin of the section is Egyptian or Palmyrene, etc., etc. I have been able to test this argument but imperfectly, yet I do feel there is more to be said in favour of it than I am able to say.

I have to thank very heartily the Rev. Prof. A. G. Cooke, D.D. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, for permission to use the tables of alphabets from his book "Northern Semitic Inscriptions". My hearty thanks are also due to the Trustees of the Oxford University Press for the loan of the blocks of Canon Cooke's tables herewith appended. Lastly I have great pleasure in acknowledging the invaluable help and encouragement of Sir Thomas Clark, Bart. I make this a personal acknowledgement apart from the publishing side. No man can wish

for more courteous and helpful publishers than Messrs T. & T. Clark, but Sir Thomas has taken a personal interest in this book which was outside the functions of publishers.

I draw attention to mistaken references in the body of the text which are corrected in the indexes, so that when a wrong reference is met with in the text the readers will kindly turn to the index where they will find the correct reading.

The U. F. MANSE,
Johnshaven
Scotland.

N. LEVISON

August 1928.

EMENDATION OF THE MASSORETIC TEXT

OF THE

OLD TESTAMENT.

PRINCIPLES of CRITICISM.

Careful study of the Old Testament soon shows that the Received Hebrew Text is not quite what could be desired. In spite of the enormous amount of labour bestowed by the Massoretes,[1] in determining what they deemed the most correct form of the Sacred Writings that could be attained, the result, at many points, is far from perfect, and even sometimes highly unsatisfactory. Granting that these scholars did their best in utilising the MSS. within their reach so as to discover what seemed, on the whole, the readings to be preferred, it must not be forgotten that much of their material had already suffered in transcription during preceding centuries. Even assuming that most of the earlier copyists had shown conscientious care in reproducing what lay before them, very great allowance must be made for the operation of factors which, at every stage in transcription, produced increasing deviation from the original MSS. Every copy made directly from the works of the Great Master-Painters or Sculptors—even the most carefully executed — shows some points of difference from

---

[1] The Jewish editors who executed their task, between the seventh and the tenth centuries, of fixing the current form of the Hebrew Scriptures.

the originals; a copy of the first copy shows still more divergence from the Masterpiece; the longer the series of imitations, the further is the removal from the noble first production, and removal of blemishes can only be affected by reverting, for correction, to the originals. In the case of books, similar deviations from the originals have inevitably taken place: even the Sacred Scriptures at the hands of a long succession of scribes, — for there has not been constant and effective divine interposition to prevent such errors[1].

Now that it is impossible to consult the original writings of the Hebrew Historians, Prophets, and Psalmists, persistent endeavour must be made otherwise to discover what, with greater or less probability, were the very words used by the authors.

In this search for better readings than we now possess, by endeavouring to get behind and beyond the Massoretic Text, valuable assistance is sometimes obtained by consulting the Targums (i. e. the Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew), the Old Latin Version, and especially the 'Septuagint', — a Greek Translation executed a few centuries before the Christian Era. The last named, though not an ideal translation, and sometimes presenting an uncertain text, frequently affords much help in connecting the revised Hebrew by pointing to more probable readings. Less assistance is afforded by the Peshito, a Syriac Version executed in the early Christian centuries[2]. After all, however, the greatest practical aid is obtained through patient and careful study of the Massoretic Text itself, which often suggests

---

1) See G. H. B. Wright on the Book of Job, pages 122 lf; T. K. Cheyne on Micah (Camb. Bible), page 13.

2) Regarding these Versions, see fuller information in Part LI. (pages 86 lf.)

more probable readings, preserved, however, in disguised or even distorted forms[1]. To learn how some errors have crept into the text is to learn how similar errors may be detected and rectified.

For satisfactory study of the deterioration undergone by the Hebrew Text during the course of past ages, it will be necessary :—

I. To classify the various lines of departure from the original.

II. To indicate the means now available for discovering more reasonable readings than are frequently presented in the current form of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Orderly consideration, under suitable categories, of different phenomena presented in the Hebrew Text will naturally determine the arrangement to be followed in this Treatise.

---

[1] See the Author's remarks in the Expositor, April, 1913 (pages 378 ff.)

PART I.

VARIOUS POSSIBILITIES OF DEPARTURE FROM THE ORIGINAL TEXT.

1. ABSENCE OF VOWEL-SIGNS IN ANCIENT HEBREW.

An obvious cause of difficulty in reading the ancient Hebrew text was the absence of vowel-marks; hence occasional misunderstanding, by readers, of the correct pronunciation, and of the precise meaning which the writer intended to be conveyed by what he wrote. A merely consonantal text must always be more or less doubtful in meaning: it is not surprising, therefore, that the Jewish mediaeval editors erred, though more careful consideration of the context might have preserved them from many such misconceptions, and thus from fixing their mistaken views for later readers. The following are but a few examples of obviously erroneous readings in the traditional text, arising from the attachment of wrong vowel-marks :—

Ps. 74/12 instead of מִקֶּדֶם פֹּעַל read בְּקִדֵּם פְּעָלַ (previously working out). In Isa. 2/4, for רַבִּים ('many'), read רָבְים ('contending'), which suits the context better; in Isa. 3/12, for נָשִׁים ('women'), read the plural participle נֹשִׁים ('usurers'), which harmonises better with what precedes; in Pro. 18/3, for the concrete רָשָׁע ('a wicked man') read the cognate abstract noun רֶשַׁע ('wickedness'), as shown by what follows; in I. Kings 13/12, the Qal form וַיִּרְאוּ ('and they saw') is mani-

festly less appropriate than the Hiphil וַיַּרְאוּ('and they showed'); in Ps. 8/2 for the unworkable form תִּנָּה, read תֻּנָּה ('is celebrated'); in Isa. 9/19 for זְרֹעוֹ ('his arm', an improbable reading) substitute זַרְעוֹ ('his seed') (i. e. his own children). In Jer. 2/34, the closing term should not be the demonstrative pronoun אֵלֶּה ('these') but a noun אֵלָה ('terebinth') or אַלָּה ('oak') as indicated in the Septuagint.

The early Versions of the Old Testament, especially the Septuagint, often throw light on passages in the Massoretic Text which are sometimes obscure, and sometimes even obviously wrong, through mistaken vocalisation. Careful comparison of these Translations with the received Hebrew frequently shows the Translators preserved the correct meaning of a passage which the Massoretes have missed; in other cases, there may be difficulty in deciding which view should be preferred, both being quite reasonable. At the close of Nah. 3/8, the Massoretic reading מִיָּם חוֹמָתָה ('from the sea (was) her wall'), describing the strong position of No-Amon, is inferior to that of the Septuagint, ὕδωρ (i. e. מַיִם) τά τεῖχη αὐτῆς ('water (was) her wall' of defence against a foe). In the middle of Jer. 31/12, the Massoretic form יַחְדָּו ('together') should rather be יַחְדּוּ ('they shall be glad') which agrees both with other verbs in the sentence and the Septuagint, χατησονται. In Ps. 109/28, the words קָמוּ וַיֵּבֹשׁוּ between which an early transcriber has fitly inserted the Note-line, calling attention to questionable readings, as they are perfects, with pretensitive meanings ('they rose up and were ashamed'), and are thus inapposite to the context, both preceding and succeeding, which expresses desires ('Let them curse, but do thou bless . . . . and let thy servant rejoice'), should rather be קָמַי יֵבֹשׁוּ ('let those who rise up against me be ashamed'), as rightly indicated in the Septuagint, οἱ ἐπιστανάμενοι μοι αἰσχυνθήτωσαν.

In Jer. 18/17, the Massoretic form אֶרְאֵם ('I shall see

them') is evidently wrong, and should rather be the factitive אַרְאֵם as required by the context and attested by the Septuagint. δείξω αὐτός ('I shall show them'). In the latter part of Ps. 109/15, treating of the Lord's dealings with the adversaries of the Psalmist, the verb-form יִכְּרֵת, has been regarded by the Massoretes as a transitive, יַכְרֵת, and thus the clause has been made to mean 'let Him cut off their remembrance from the earth'; whereas the Greek translator has read the form as a passive, יִכָּרֵת, involving a slightly different construction,'may their remembrance be destroyed from the earth'. In Isa. 24/23, the two words appearing in the Massoretic Text as הַלְּבָנָה and הַחַמָּה (poetic terms for 'the sun' and 'the moon' respectively) are represented in the Septuagint by ἡ πλίνθος and τὸ τεῖχος, הַלְּבֵנָה and הַחוֹמָה ('the brick' and 'the city-wall'.) In Ps. 78/4 (77/3 in Sept.), the Massoretic text shows the active verbform נְכַחֵד ('we will hide'). while the Greek translator shows by his rendering (ἐκεύβη) that he regarded it as the passive נִכְחַד ('it was hidden'). The Massoretic reading לֹא אִתָּנוּ יוֹדֵעַ ('there is not with us one who knows') in Ps. 74/9, is represented in the Septuagint (73/9) by ἡμᾶς οὐ γνώσεται לֹא אוֹתָנוּ יֵדַע ('he will not know us').

Specially noteworthy are the instances in which the unvowelled form לא has been regarded as the negative לֹא (or לוֹא), or as לְא (for לוּא) introducing the protasis in a purely hypothetical proposition: the Massoretes have frequently shown themselves less observant of the context than the Alexandrian translators and have thus fixed the reading as לֹא, when לְא should have been preferred. The first half of Ps. 51/18 (marked by the note-line) לֹא תַחְפֹּץ זֶבַח וְאֶתְּנָה presents a somewhat unusual construction, but may be rendered, 'Thou desirest not sacrifice, that I should give' (it) (or, 'else would I give 'it): the Septuagint translator, however, read לא as לְא, and has rendered the clause, εἰ ἠθέ-

λησας θυσίαν ἔδωκα ἄν ('If thou hadst desired sacrifice, I would have given' (it)). The first term in part of Laban's chiding words to Jacob, as given in the received Hebrew text of Gen. 31 27, לא הִגַּדְתָּ לִי וַאֲשַׁלְּחֲךָ בְּשִׂמְחָה ('Thou didst not tell me.....), should rather be לֵא, as indicated in the Septuagint rendering εἰ ἀνήγγαιλάς μοι ἐξαπέστειλα ἄν σε μετ' εὐφροσύνης ('If thou hadst told me, I would have sent thee away with rejoicing'). A double illustration appears in Ps. 55 12, where the Massoretic text had been rendered, 'It was not an enemy that reproached me, then I could have borne it; neither was it he who hated me that did magnify himself against me, then I would have hid myself from him' : the Greek translator, however, has more appropriately read לא as לֵא, and given the preferable rendering, ὅτι εἰ ἐχθρός ὠνείδισέ με ,ὑπηνεγκα ἄν, καὶ εἰ ὁ μισῶν ἐπ'ἐμὲ ἐυεγάλορρημόσεν, ἐκερυβην ἄν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ('If an enemy had reproached me, I would have endured it; and if one who hated me had spoken haughtily against me, I would have hid myself from him').

2. WANT OF UNIFORMITY IN THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE VOWEL-LETTERS (א ה ו י)[1].

Variableness in the way of these letters frequently

---

[1] See a valuable paper by Prof. D. Chwolson in Vol. II. of Travaux de la 3ᵉ· session du congres International des Orientalistes, translated by T. K. Abbot in Hebraica for Jan. 1890 ('The Quiescents (or vowel-letters) א ה ו י in ancient Hebrew orthography') : also Studien zur Geschichte des Orthographie des Althebräischen, by Leo Bardowicz. (Frankfurt a. M. 1894) ; W. Wright on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages (Cambridge, 1890), pages 69 lf. See also the earlier works by Dr. Waie ('Critical notes on the Old Testament....2ⁿᵈ. Vol. 1734).

causes uncertainty regarding the exact sense of a passage : omission (especially) or insertion may affect the meaning considerably.

(a) Omission of א may prove particularly troublesome. Various forms of one and the same noun signifying 'a wild ox' are רְאֵם, רֵים, and רֵם : see Ps. 92 11 ; Job 39/9,10 ; Ps. 22/22 etc. The term רָשׁ 'poor', (I. Sam. 18/22 etc.) sometimes appears in the form רָאשׁ (II. Sam. 12/1 etc.) : and the cognate abstract noun, signifying 'poverty', takes the forms of רֵאשׁ רִישׁ רִישׁ (Prov. 28/19 ; 13/18 ; 30/8 etc.) In I. Sam. 25/8. the form בָּנוּ in the Massoretic text might be taken to mean 'in us', but the marginal note properly points out that the correct form is בָּאנוּ 'We have come'. In Ps. 21/2, פָּסוּ is a transcriptional error for אָפְסוּ ('cease'), or ('fail') ; in Job 27/8, for the questionable form יֵשָׂל, we should read יִשָּׁאֵל ('requireth') ; in Num. 11/11, the Massoretes have noted that, מָצָתִי ought correctly to be מָצָאתִי ('I have found') : in I. Kings 21/29, they have noted that, אָבִי should be אָבִיא ('I will bring'). In II. Sam. 11 1, the Massoretes have noted that הַמַּלְאָכִים (which would mean 'the messengers') is a transcriptional error for הַמְּלָכִים ('the kings'). In Gen. 47/16, for הָבוּ ('give ye'), read הָבִיאוּ ('bring ye', Sept. φέρετε) ; in Ex. 14/31, for הַיָּד read הָאֵיד ('the disaster') ; in Ex. 15/25, וַיּוֹרֵהוּ should be וַיַּרְאֵהוּ ('and he showed him, Sept. καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ.

(b) As regards ו, such cases as the contraction of בָּהֶם into בָּם ('in them'), or אַתָּה, written as אָתְּ, do not mislead ; but when, as in II. Chr. 29/21, the Hiphil infinitive לְהַעֲלוֹת is misread by the Septuagint translator as the Qal לַעֲלוֹת, and thus represented by ἀναβαίνειν ('to go up'), the meaning becomes seriously affected. In Lev. 15 31, the Massoretic form וְהִזַּרְתֶּם ('and ye shall set apart') was originally וְהִזְהַרְתֶּם ('and ye shall warn') as testified by the Greek rendering εὐ-λαβεῖς ποιήσετε. In Ps. 3/2 and 25/9, רַבּוּ ('are many')

should perhaps rather be רָעֲבוּ ('are fierce'); similarly, in Ps. 40 4, רַבִּים ('many') should probably be, רָהָבִים ('rude men').

(c) The insertion or omission of ו is sometimes a mere matter of taste or inclination on the part of the transcriber, and thus makes no difference in the meaning: thus, the fully written אוֹתוֹת ('signs') in Deut. 6 22 etc. appears again as אֹתֹת in 7/19; similarly, while the plural form יְשֻׁעוֹת appears in Ps. 53 7, the singular form יְשׁוּעַת occurs in the parallel Ps. 14 7. Similarly a slight change of the construct singular חוֹמַת ('wall') into חוֹמוֹת makes this mean 'walls'; conversely in Jer. 4/4, the unsuitable plural form עָרְלוֹת ('foreskins') should rather be the singular עָרְלַת ('foreskin'), and in Num. 25/32, instead of לָנוּס ('to flee'), it is better to read לָנֶס ('for one who flees'). Considerable modification of meaning appears in Ps. 31/11, where בַּעֲוֹנִי ('through mine iniquity') seems inappropriate to the context, and probably ought rather to be בָּעֳנִי ('through distress'). The omission of ו from the end of some verb-forms often makes these appear as singulars, when they should really be plurals; thus in Ps. 97/7, אָכַל should be אָכְלוּ ('they have devoured'), as shown by the corresponding plural form at the end; יָלַד appears in Gen. 35/26, and 46/27, instead of יָלְדוּ ('were born'); conversely, in Ps. 105/27, the plural form שָׂמוּ should be the singular שָׂם ('he put'); and for חָלְקוּ, in Ps. 55 22 it is better to substitute, as predicate, the adjective חָלָק ('smooth'). Instances in which, through the omission of a prefixed ו from a 'converted' perfect, the correct meaning of the form is no longer that of the imperfect, occur in Zach. 13 9, where אֹמַרְתִּי should be וְאָמַרְתִּי ('and I will say'); conversely, the form תִּשָּׁחֵת in Ex. 8 70 (Gr. and Eng. 8 24) should be וְתִשָּׁחֵת ('and the land stank'). In Isa. 14/15, the Massoretes have given us תּוּרַד ('thou shalt be brought down'), while the Septuagint καταβήσῃ points to תֵּרֵד ('thou shalt go down').

(d) Many are the instances in which the inconside-

rate insertion or inadvertent omission of י seriously affects the meaning of a form. Cases of omission in the Massoretic text appear in Mic. 3/8, where the troublesome אֶת should be אִתִּי ('with me'); in Prov. 8/12, where יִרְאַת and שְׂנֹאת should respectively be יָרֵאתִי ('I fear') and שָׂנֵאתִי ('I hate'); in Jud. 19/11, where רַד should be יָרַד ('had gone down'); in Ps. 8/9, where the singulars צִפּר and עֹבֵר should be replaced by צִפֳּרֵי aud עֹבְרֵי (Const. Plurals). On the other hand, the addition of י has sometimes seriously changed the sense, as in Lam. 3/28, where עָלָיו ('upon him') should rather be עֻלּוֹ ('his yoke'); in Ruth 4/5, the Qeri קָנִיתִי is properly indicated by the Massoretes to be an error for קָנִיתָ ('thou hast purchased'); in Isa. 1 7, זָרִים ('strangers') should be זֶרֶם ('rain-storm') in Prov. 10 21, for צַדִּיק ('righteous') read צֶדֶק ('righteousness') but the converse in Isa. 1 21 ; in Ps. 89/3, for אָמַרְתִּי, read אָמַרְתָּ, as indicated by the Septuagint. ἔιπας ('thou hast said'); in II. Sam. 1/19 חָלָל ('wounded') is a transcriptional error for הֵילֵל ('wail'); in Isa. 50 42 כְּאִישׁ ('like a man') has been misread by the Septuagint translator, whose rendering is ὡς πῦρ ('like fire'); in Job. 19 22 for אֵל ('God'), read אַיָּל ('a deer'). In verbs, a perfect should often be an imperfect : נָחַנִי ('hath led me') in Ps. 60 11 should be יַנְחֵנִי ('will lead me').

3. INTERCHANGES OF THE VOWEL-LETTERS.

It is also to be noted that the vowel-letters are frequently interchanged in writing ; this substitution, however, is much more common in Aramaic and in Samaritan. Owing to the extreme lightness of their sounds, they are not easily distinguished by the ear, hence, mis-spelling by transcribers is not uncommon,and the sense of a sentence is considerably altered.

(a) Passages in which א and ה have been interchanged are Zach. 9 8, showing מִצָּבָה for מִצָּבָא ; Jer. 8 14, presenting מַרְפֵּה for מַרְפֵּא in II. Sam. 1 10, וְאֶצְעָדָה should be וְהַצְעָדָה ('and the armlet') ; in Ps. 60 4, for רְפָה read רְפָא ('heal thou'), as in Num. 12 13 ; in II. Sam. 3 18 הוֹשִׁיעַ should be אוֹשִׁיעַ (as shown by the Septuagint σώσω, 'I shall save') ; in Hab. 2 18, וּמוֹרֶה should be וּמוֹרָא ('and an object of fear') in Gen. 23 6, יִכְלֶה should be יִכְלָא ('will withhold') ; in 38 5, וְהָיָה should be וְהִיא ('and she'). The converse change is shown in Ex. 32 31, where אָנָּא ('pray !') should be הִנֵּה ('behold').

(b) Substitution of ו for א is seen in many passages where גּוֹיִם ('nations') appears instead of גֵּאִים ('haughty ones'): see especially Ps. 9 6, 16, 18, 21 ; 118 10 etc. The converse substitution is seen in בְּאֵר ('well', 'pit', or 'cistern'), which is more frequently written בּוֹר (Gen. 37 20, 22, 24, 28 ; Ex. 21 33 ; Deut. 6 11. Specially noteworthy are the numerous cases in which לֹא ('not') and לוֹ ('to him') are confused : see Ex. 21 8 ; Isa. 9 2 ; 49 5, where, as noted by the Massoretes, the former wrongly appears instead of the latter ; Ps. 100 3 is ambiguous, as either form makes good sense.

(c) On the interchange of א and י, רֵאשֵׁךְ ('thy poverty') in Prov. 6 11, with רֵישֵׁךְ in 24 34 ; see also Jer. 48 31, where יֶהְגֶּה is an obvious error for אֶהֱגֶּה ('I will moan'), and Isa. 14 30, where יַהֲרֹג should be אַהֲרֹג ('I will kill') : conversely, in Isa. 10 12 אֶפְקֹד should be יִפְקֹד ('he shall punish') as shown by the context. Conversely, in Prov. 4 14, תְּאַשֵּׁר should rather be תִּישַׁר ('go forward'), in Isaiah 51 19, אֲנַחֲמֵךְ should be יְנַחֲמֵךְ in order to restore the meaning rightly conserved in the Septuagint. (παρακαλέσει σε) ; Who shall comfort thee?).

(d) On the confusion of ה with י, see Gen. 47 3, where רֹעֵה must be a clerical error for the plural construct form רֹעֵי, which appears in 46 32 ; conversely, in Nah. 1 7, for the plural construct form, the singular חֹסֶה should be read ; in Ex. 8/11, וְהַכְבֵּד should be וַיַּכְבֵּד ('and he hardened).

The double case Ex. 18/6 אֲנִי is represented in the Septuagint as הִנֵּה ('behold').

(e) Interchange of ה and ו is seen in Jer, 26, שִׁילָה being found in verse 6, but שִׁילוֹ in verse 9; numerous are the instances in which ה the old form of the 3rd. sing. masc. suffix appears instead of the latter form ו; see שִׁירָה ('his song') in Ps. 42/9.

4. SUBSTITUTION OF SIMILARLY SOUNDED CONSONANTS OTHER THAN VOWEL-LETTERS.

The extent to which the meaning of a word may be modified through the substitution of one vowel-letter for an other having a similar sound, is small as compared with the wide field opened up when other letters are considered. In surveying this wider field, it will be most convenient to take each consonant in its alphabetical order.

(a) א has sometimes been confounded with ג, probable because this was sounded softly. Thus, in Job. 2/10, גַּם in the M. T. is אִם represented in the Septuagint by εἰ τὰ ('if'); see a similar case in Zach. 3/7. Conversely, in Isa. 42/4, אִיִּים should probably be גּוֹיִם ('nations'), as indicated by ἐθνη in the Septuagint. In Hab. 3/7, the questionable expression אָהֳלֵי כוּשָׁן ('tents of Cushan') seems to be a mistranscription of גַּחֲלֵי כִבְשָׁן ('burning coals of a furnace').

On confusion of א with ה, see page 11.

On confusion of א with ו, see page 11.

א has sometimes been confounded with ח, as in Prov. 20/2 where אֵימַת should rather be חֵמַת ('burning wrath'); in Ps. 54/7 בַּאֲמִתֶּךָ ('in thy truth') should obviously be בַּחֲמָתְךָ, conversely, in Ps. 14/6, מַחְסֵהוּ ('His refuge') is found, but מְאָסָם ('he rejected them') in the parallel passage, Ps. 53/6; in Ps. 58/5, חֵמַת (twice), should rather be אֵימַת ('terror').

On the confusion between א and י, see page 11.

Though א has a weak sound, and כ is strong, some instances occur which show that one has been mistaken for the other: thus, in Joel 1/13, the tame form בֹּאוּ ('enter ye'), read בְּכוּ ('weep ye'); in Hos. 13/2, for אֹפְרִים, read כֹּמְרִים ('idolatrous priests'); in Jud. 8/6, הֲכַף should be הֲאַף ('actually. . . ?'); in Ex. 32/2, instead of כִּי זֶה it is better to read אֵי זֶה ('where ?').

(b) א and ע are very frequently confounded. Thus, the prepositions אֶל and עַל both in these simple and in their suffixed forms, though bearing different and distinctive meanings, are frequently interchanged, especially in the Books of Samuel and Jeremiah (see Driver on I. Sam. 13/.), even in the same verse: instances appear in I. Sam. 25/17;25; II. Sam. 2/9; 3/29; Jer. 10/1; 25/15; 28/8; 33/14; Ps. 79/6 etc. Similarly, אַתָּה ('Thou') and עַתָּה ('now') are very often interchanged, and careful consideration of the context is necessary for deciding which of the two terms is to be preferred; the Septuagint also, frequently exhibiting σὺ or νῦν where the M. T. presents the converse equivalent, affords sufficient assistance: see Josh. 3/8; I Kings 1/18; Ps. 85/7; I Sam. 18/22; 28/2; II. Sam. 7/20 etc. For נְאֻם in Isa. 66/2, read the noun נֹעַם; and for the same form read the adjective נָעִים in Ps. 36/2; for אֶרֶץ in Isa. 11/4 (twice) read עָרִיץ ('ruthless'); for מֵאֲשֶׁר in Isa. 43/4, read מֵעֹשֶׁר ('more than riches') Ps. 42/2, עַל appears in the first half, אֶל in the second; Ps. 35/15: for קָרְעוּ read קָרְאוּ ('they cried'). Ps. 69/28 for עָוֹן raed אָוֶן ('calamity): see parallel in Prov. 22/8: conversely, in Isa. 10/1, for אָוֶן read עָוֹן.

(c) ב in its soft pronunciation, may readily be confused with ו, which it then closely resembles. In Isa. 48/16 וְרוּחוֹ ('and His spirit') should obviously be בְּרוּחוֹ ('by His spirit'); in Num. 12/8, ומַרְאֶה should be בְּמַרְאֶה (Septuagint rightly ἐν εἴδει), as shown by the clause following: con-

versely, in Isa. 57,1 בְּאֵין should be וְאֵין as in the first part of the same verse; in Ezek. 21,25, for בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם (an impossible reading), restore וִירוּשָׁלַיִם ('and Jerusalem'). On the same ground of this similarity of sound may be explained the occurrence in Ps. 129,3 of גַּב ('back') instead of גֵּו in I. Kings, 14,9. Ezek. 23,35, or the more frequently occurring גֵּוֶךְ Isa. 38,17; 50,6; 51,23 etc.

(d) Confusion of ב with its resemblant מ is exceedingly common. It is hardly possible, however, to determine with any feeling of confidence, whether the substitution is due to similarity of sound or similarity of form.[1] Only a few illustrations, need be given. For the Kethiv אֲבָנָה, in II. Kings 5,12, the Qeri is אֲמָנָה; in Jon. 2,3, instead of מִצָּרָה ('out of distress'), the Septuagint rendering, ἐν θλίψει points to בְּצָרָה ('in distress'); in Gen. 10,8, for the proper name נִמְרֹד, the Septuagint reading is Νεβεωδ; in II. Sam. 6,3, the Septuagint equivalent of אֲבִינָדָב, is Ἀμιναδαβ (Codices B and A.); in Isa. 1,25, for וְאָשִׁיבָה ('and I will turn') read וְאָשִׁימָה ('and I will lay'); in Ex. 30,34, a more probable reading than בַּד בְּבַד is מַד בְּמַד ('measure for measure'); in Ps. 51,10, for תַּשְׁמִיעֵנִי, read תַּשְׂבִּיעֵנִי ('satisfy me').

(e) Confusion of ב with its kindred labial פ is only to be expected. In Ex. 5,5, the inappropriate form רַבִּים ('many') should be רָפִים ('slack') or ('remiss'); in II. Sam. 10,16, the name of the Syrian General is given as שׁוֹבַךְ, while שׁוֹפַךְ appears in the parallel passage I. Chr. 19,16; in Ps. 59,8, חֲרָבוֹת ('swords') should be חֲרָפוֹת ('reproaches'); conversely, in Ps. 57,4, חֶרֶף should rather be מֵחֶרֶב ('from the sword'), מ having been inadvertently omitted after נִ

---

[1] Comparison of the forms of the two letters as these appear in several of the earlier alphabets with those now in common use will at once show how readily one of the two characters could be mistaken for the other.

which immediately precedes ; in Nah. 2/4, the term הַבְּרוֹשִׁים ('the cypress-trees'), inappropriate in a passage which treats of war, should be הַפָּרָשִׁים ('the horsemen'); in II. Sam. 7/7, the unsuitable form שִׁבְטֵי ('tribes') must give way to שֹׁפְטֵי ('judges'); as shown in the parallel passage, I. Chr. 17 6[1]. Conversely, in Ps. 80/17 פָּנֶיךָ should be בָּנֶיךָ. Prov. 25 8, instead of the perplexing form פֶּן ('lest'), read בִּין ('consider'); in Isa. 3/15, for פְּנֵי ('face'), a better reading, perhaps, is בְּנֵי ('children'); in Ps. 80 3, and Prov. 4 5, for לְפָנַי, the readings לִבְנֵי ('for the children') is probably to be preferred, similarly לְפָנִים should perhaps be לְבָנִים in Job. 17/6; in Prov. 19 29, for שְׁפָטִים, read שְׁבָטִים, ('rods').

(c) ג is rarely confused with ה, though הָרִים ('mountains') in Amos 4/13 should be גֶּרֶם ('body'); and in Nah. 2 5, יִתְהוֹלְלוּ should be יִתְגּוֹלְלוּ ('shall roll'); in the command, 'break thou their teeth', Ps. 58/7, the imperative הָרֹס, which is applied elsewhere to the breaking down of buildings (Jud. 6/28; Isa. 14/17; Ezek. 13/14; 26/4, 12 etc.) should probably be a Piel, גָּרֵס, as a cognate Hiphil in Lam. 3/16 indicates 'breaking of teeth'. Ps. 44/2 for הוֹרַשְׁתָּ read גֵּרַשְׁתָּ ('thou didst expel').

More frequently, ג has been confused with ח, as in Ps. 13/6, where גָּמַל sholud rather be חָמַל ('pitied'); and in Joel 2/8, where גִּבֹּר should be חֲבֹר, in Hos. 10/5 for יָגִילוּ read יָחִילוּ.

Rarely is ג confounded with כ, as in Ps. 80/16, where כַּנָּה should be גַּנָּה ('garden'); and in Isa. 5/13, where גָּלָה should be כָּלָה inasmuch as the context does not point to captivity but rather to punishing; further on, in verse 17, the inappropriate form גֵּרִים ('strangers') should rather be וְכָרִים ('and fat lambs').

---

1) The Septuagint translators often confuse שֵׁבֶט with שֵׁפֶט see their renderings in Num. 25/25; Mic. 4/14; I. Chr. 28/1 (Cod. B.) etc.

ג is somewhat frequently confused with ע, as in Ps. 7/17, where עֲמָלוֹ should rather be גְּמָלוֹ ('his recompense'); in Ps. 113/4 where גּוֹיִם (queried by the Note-line) should be עָבִים ('clouds') the questionable form גּוֹזִי in Ps. 71/6 should be עֻזִּי ('my strength'); in Ex. 14/19, וַיִּסַּע has twice been miswritten instead of וַיָּסַג ('removed').

Further, ג is osmetimes confounded with ק, as in II. Sam. 15/24, where the impracticable form וַיַּצִּיקוּ ('and they poured out') should be וַיַּצִּיגוּ ('and they placed'); in Ezek. 32/29 בִּגְבוּרָתָם ('in their might') should rather be בְּקִבְרוֹתָם ('in their sepulches'); in Isa. 8/15 the Septuagint translators have mis-read וְנוֹקְשׁוּ ('and they shall be snared') as וְנִגְּשׁוּ ('and they shall approach', draw near. καὶ ἐγγιοῦσι)

(d) ד is naturally confused with other dentals, but in varying measure. Interchange with ז[1] appears in Jud. 12/2, where מְאֹד ('very') is an evident error for מֵאָז ('long since') Ps. 71/7 last word עֹז should be עוֹד (my confidence still). In Num. 24/17, דָּרַךְ uhould be זָרַח ('there ariseth') (as shown by the Septuagint ἀνατελεῖ); in Job. 17/1, the unique form נִזְעֲכוּ should be נִדְעֲכוּ ('are evtinguished'); in Ps. 63/3 עֻזֶּךָ ('thy strength') should rather be הוֹדֶךָ ('thy majesty'), and in Ps. 78/61, עֻזּוֹ should rather be הוֹדוֹ ('his majesty'). In Ps. 65/7, נָאְזָר ('girt about') must be a transcriptional error for נֶאְדָּר ('glorious'), as shown by the parallels in Ex. 15/11 and 6.

Seldom has ד given place to ט, as in Ps.107/39, where וַיִּמְעֲטוּ ('and they are diminished') should be וַיִּמְעֲדוּ ('and they totter'); conversely, in Amos 1/11, לָעַד ('for ever') should be כָּעַיִט ('like a bird of prey').

---

[1] Foot-Note. If זֶה ('this') with the corresponding Arabic dâ and Aramaic דְּנָא. It is of importance to note the resemblance in sound between dentals and sibilants, see an excellent paper by D. B. Macdonald in The Cambridge Journal of Semitic Vol. XV. pp. 100 If.

Rarely also confusion takes place between ד and ס; but in Ps. 31/12, the impracticable form מְאד should give place to מָאס ('an object of aversion') see Lam. 3/45; see also in Ps. 78/59.

ד is even changed into the strong dental צ, as in Ps. 1/1, where בַּעֲצַת ('in the counsel') should rather be בַּעֲדַת ('in the company'); conversely, in Amos 8/14, דַּרְכְּךָ must be an error for צִיּרְךָ ('thine idol').

ד confounded with ש. Ps. 36/13 for דָּחוּ read שָׁחוּ ('they sink'); Isa. 3/13 for נִגְּדָיו read נִגְּשָׁיו.

Somewhat frequently, ד has been confused with ת; thus, in Prov. 12/6, דָּם ('blood') should be תָּם ('upright', or 'honest') and similarly in Prov. 1/11, לְדָם ('for blood') should be לְתָם ('for an honest man'); in Amos. 4/7, for בְּעוֹד read בְּעִתּוֹ ('in its proper season'); in Mic. 1/7, for עַד־יְהוּדָה, read עֵת־יְהוּדָה ('the time of Judah') (for her judgment); in Isa. 33/12. שִׂיד ('lime') must be a transcriptional error for שִׂית ('thorns').

(e) ה has already been shown to interchange with similarly weak consonants (see pages 7—11) : illustrations of its interchange with stronger consonants will now be given.

Naturally, ה is apt to be confused with ח, not merely because of their resemblance in aspiration, but also because of their similarity of form, seen in the modern Hebrew alphabet (see later, page 33—36). Such verbs as הָיָה ('to be') and חָיָה ('to live'), with their manifold derivatives, alone supply many examples; in Prov. 3/27, יְהֵיֶה should be יְחַיֶּה ('preserveth alive'). Moreover, for כֹּה, read כֹּחַ ('power') in Jer. 23/29; in Jer. 16/7, for לָהֶם, read לֶחֶם ('bread'); in Isa. 11/1, for יִפְרֶה ('shall flourish') read יִפְרַח ('shall sprout'); a converse change of תִּפְרַח to תִּפְרֶה should be made in Hab. 3/17; in Ps. 10/8, for the troublesome form לְחֵלְכָה, read לְהֹלְכָה ('for the passers by'); in II. Sam. 1/19, for חָלָל ('wounded') read הֵילֵל ('Wail !'); in Prov. 28/25, for רְחַב read רַהַב ('insolent'), and in 21/4, for וְרַחַב ,read וְרַהַב ('and insolence').

Interchange of ה and י has already received illustration; see page 17.

That ה was at least sometimes pronounced with more force than it now receives may explain why כ often unexpectedly appears instead; the suffixes of the second person thus occur where those of the third are rather to be expected. In Hos. 2/8, דַּרְכֵּךְ ('thy way') is found where the context, together with the Septuagint (τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῆς), shows the correct reading to be דַּרְכָּהּ ('Her way'); conversely, in Nah. 2/14, for רִכְבָּהּ, read רִכְבֵּךְ ('thy chariots'). In Zech. 14/5 (end), עִמָּךְ ('with thee') unexpectedly appears where we would expect עִמּוֹ (for עִמּוֹ; 'with him'); and in 10/1, for לָהֶם restore the true reading לָכֶם ('to you') as required by the context, and attested by the Peshito; in Ps. 56/14, for הֲלֹא (N o u n e?), read כְּלָא ('keep', 'restrain'); in Isa. 9/1. instead of עֲלֵיהֶם, עֲלֵיכֶם has been read by the Greek translators, as shown by their rendering (ἐφ' ὑμᾶς upon you); in Ps. 22/28, instead of the inappropriate term יִזְכְּרוּ ('shall remember'), read יִזָּהֲרוּ ('let them be warned').

Interchange of ה with the stronger aspirate ע is not uncommon. In Ezek. 38/20, instead of הֶהָרִים ('the mountains'), the correct reading must be הֶעָרִים ('the cities'); in Deut. 1/42, for לָהֶם read the more definite לָעָם ('to the people'); in Jud. 5/5 and in Ps. 68/9, instead of the abnormal construction זֶה סִינַי (sometimes rendered 'this Sinai' or 'Sinai, itself'), read זָע־סִינַי ('Sinai shook'), as shown by the parallelism.

Somewhat rarely, and strangely, ה and ק are found interchanged, as in II. Sam. 23/13, where קָצִיר ('harvest') should rather be הַצּוּר ('the rock'), (τὴν πέτραν in Lucian); and in Jer. 8/10, where עֹשֶׁה שֶׁקֶר ('acting falsely'), as in Mal. 3/5, should rather be עֹשֵׁק שָׂכִיר ('an oppressor of the hireling').

The sounds of ה and ש like ח and שׂ see later; were apt to be confounded. Illustrations appear in Exod. 9/23, where וַתְּהַלֶּךְ should rather be וַתְּשַׁלַּח ('and it was hurled');

and in Hos. 11/8, where a better reading than נֶהְפַּךְ עָלַי ('is turned upon me') is נִשְׁפַּךְ עָלֶיךָ, which makes the clause mean 'my heart is poured out on thee'; in Zeph. 3/17, for יַחֲרִישׁ read יֶחֱדֶה ('he will be glad') as the context requires; in Ps. 44/3, for הוֹרַשְׁתָּ, read שֵׁרַשְׁתָּ ('thou didst root out'); Isa. 40/21 מֵרֹאשׁ should rather be מַרְאֶה ('a vision sight').

On confusion of ו with ב, see remarks already made on page 13. The sound of ו and that of פ are similar, in Ps. 44/15; The questionable imperative צַוֵּה ('command') may be regarded as a mistranscription of the participle צָפֶה ('watching'); in Ps. 71/3, צִוִּיתָ ('thou hast commanded') is more appropriately to be read as צָפִיתָ ('thou hast kept watching').

In examining cases in which ז has been confused with other letters, its dual nature must be noted: (1) as a dental, it interchanges with other dentals. (ד, ט, ת); (2) as a sibilant, it is confused with other sibilants (ס, שׂ, שׁ).

Interchange of ז with ד has already been considered (Page 16).

The similarity in sound between a sibilant and a strong aspirate (שׂ or שׁ) and (ת) has obviously caused confusion between ז and ח; on this ground may be explained the occurrence, in Ps. 75/19 of the inappropriate verb-form תִּבְזֶה ('thou shalt despise'), which should rather be תִּמְחֶה ('thou shalt wipe out') like a cloud, their prosperity; שְׁלֹמָם (כָּעוֹב).

The sounds of ז and ט are so much akin that words in which one of these letters occurs are apt to be mistaken for similar words in which the other letter occupies a like position: instances occur in which זָבַח ('to slay animals in sacrifice'), with its derivatives, is confused with the resemblant טָבַח ('to slaughter' animals for food) and its derivatives. Hence, in Prov. 17/1, זִבְחֵי should rather be טִבְחֵי; for תִּזְבַּח (marked by the Note-line) in Deut. 12/15, read תִּטְבַּח ('thou mayest slaughter', for food to thyself') similarly, in I. Kings 1/9, 19, 25, for וַיִּזְבַּח read וַיִּטְבַּח.

Between ז and ס, which is a sharper sibilant, confusion sometimes arises; as when מֶסֶךְ ('mixed (viz. spiced) wine', Ps. 75/9) is written מֶזֶג (Cant. 7/3); in Prov. 27/7, for the unsuitable תָּבוּס ('trampleth on') read תָּבוּז ('despiseth'); in Ps. 58/4, זָרוּ should be סָרוּ ('have gone astray'); similarly, in Ps. 78/31, זָרוּ should rather be סָגוּ ('they turned aside') in Ps. 76/8, מָאַז should give place to the participle מֹאֵס ('despising').

As ז and צ are similar in sound, confusion between these two letters is only to be expected. Thus, in Isa. 29/5, זָרֶיךָ gives too mild a meaning ('thy strangers') to suit the context, and should be: צָרֶיךָ ('thine adversaries'); similarly, in Obad. 11 זָרִים should be צָרִים; in Ps. 16/3, for בָּאָרֶץ read כְּאֶרֶז ('like a cedar tree'); the verbs עָלַז (Isa. 23/12; Ps, 28/7 etc.) and עָלַץ (I. Sam. 2/1; Ps/9/3 etc.) as well as עָלַס (Job 28/18) have in common the meaning to 'rejoice'; similarly זָעַק (Jud. 6/8; Jer. 11/11,12 etc.) and צָעַק (II. Kings 4/1, 40; Jer. 22/20 etc.) both signify to 'cry out' (in distress). In I. Sam. 16/14, I. Chron. 13/8, and II. Chr. 30/21, for עֹז ('strength') read עֵץ ('wood').

Rarely is ז interchanged with שׂ or שׁ, as in Ps. 31/23, where, for the strange and unique נִגְרַזְתִּי ('I am cut off'), substitution should be made to נִגְרַשְׁתִּי ('I am driven out'); in Ps. 59/11, where, instead of אֲשַׁמְּרָה, we should read אֲזַמְּרָה ('I will sing'); in Ex. 15/2; Ps. 118/14 and Isa. 12/2, for זִמְרָה ('song') read שִׁמְרָתִי ('my guard'); in Ps. 28/12, the unsuitable form יְחֻפַּשׂ must be a transcriptional error for יַחְפֹּז ('flees in alarm').

Ps. 27/3 בְּזֹאת may be an error for בְּשֹׁאָה ('in the midst of desolation'). Num. 11/31, for וַיָּגָז read וַיִּגַּשׁ ('and it brought') Isa. 40/10 for בְּחָזָק read בְּחֶשֶׁק in affection (deep love).

Confusion between ז and ת naturally arose when the letter was pronounced—and is even yet in some communities—as a sibilant: instances occur in Deut. 32/24, where

מְזֵי־רָעָב (the first term in which has by some been regarded as the construct plural of a supposed form מָזֶה, signifying 'sucked out', or 'empty') should rather be מְתֵי רָעָב ('dying of hunger'); similarly, in Gen. 39/5, Ex. 5/23 Josh. 14/10 and other passages, מֵאָז is a transcriptional error for מֵעֵת ('from the time' (that) i. e. 'since'); conversely, the unworkable form וְהָאֲזִינִים in Mic. 6/2 is shown by the context to be an error for וְהַאֲזִינוּ ('and give ear').

Confusion of ח with the weaker ה has already been illustrated page 17.

Noteworthy instances of confusion between ח and י—which must have sometimes been pronounced with a decidedly consonantal sound—are seen in Prov. 1/26, 27, where פַּחְדְּכֶם ('your dread') should be פִּידְכֶם ('your calamity') as required by the context (cf. also 3/25); see the converse substitution in Prov. 14/15, where יָבִין should be יִבְחַן ('tests' or 'proves'); in I. Kings 2/8, for the somewhat tame term יָרַד ('he came down'), it is better to read חָרֵד ('he came trembling', (Cf. I. Sam. 16/4; 21/2).

Confusion of ח with כ is so common that only a few illustrations need be given. In Ps. 49/5, the opening term אָח ('brother'), should rather be אַךְ ('Verily'), which, indeed, is attested by some Hebrew MSS.; in Jud. 10/18, for יָחֵל ('will begin') read יָכֹל ('is able') or יוּכַל ('will be able'); in Prov. 31/10, for מִכְרָה read מְחִירָהּ ('her price'); in Ex. 10/10 and Amos 5/14, for כֵּן ('so') read חֵן ('favour'); in Ps, 44/20 for דִּכִּיתָנוּ ('thou hast crushed us') read דְּחִיתָנוּ ('thou hast pushed us'); in Isa. 3/14 for הַכֶּרֶם read הַחֵרֶם ('the consecrated thing'). Ps. 114/15. for שֶׁכָּכָה read שֶׁחָכָה ('waits for') Isa, 9/3 for חַחַתָּ read כִּתַּת ('thou hast shattered'). Isa. 21/5 for מִשְׁחוּ read מִשְׁכוּ ('seize'),

The sounds of ח and ס—a strong aspirate and a sibilant are apt to be confounded (like ה and שׂ, as already shown on (pp. 18—19). In Ps. 35/3, וְסָגֹר must be a transcriptional

error for נֶחֱגֹר, which will make the clause mean 'and gird thyself to meet my persecutor'.

Somewhat frequently also, ח and ע, both being strong gutturals, are confounded. In Ps. 97/11, for the unsuitable form זָרֻע ('sown') read זָרַח ('ariseth'), as attested by the Septuagint (ἀνέτειλε) ; in Zeph. 2/14, for חֹרֶב ('desolation') read עֹרֵב ('raven') in I. Sam. 17/7. וְחֵץ is rightly corrected by the Massoretes to וְעֵץ ('and the wood'); in II. Kings 20/13, the opening word is וַיִּשְׁמַע ('and he heard'), while וַיִּשְׂמַח ('and he rejoiced') is the reading in the parallel passage, Isa. 39/12; Jer. 2/25 for מִיָּחֵף read מִיָּצֹף (from becoming tired through runing).

Confusion further appears between ח and ק, as in Gen. 27/42, where מִתְנַחֵם ('comforting himself') should rather be מִתְנַקֵּם ('avenging himself'); in Gen. 4/20, where וּמִקְנֶה ('and cattle') should be וּמַחֲנֶה ('and camp'). In Ps. 52/11, for וַאֲקַוֶּה which makes its clause mean ('and I will wait for thy name'); read וַאֲחַוֶּה, to secure the suitable rendering 'and I will declare thy name'. In Ps. 55/22, for וְקֶרֶב לִבּוֹ, read וְחֶרֶב בְּלִבּוֹ ('but a sword (was) in his heart'); in Ezek. 26/16, instead of the impracticable form חֲרָדוֹת (queried by the Note-line), read קְדֵרוֹת which makes the clause in which it stands mean 'with dark garmens shall they clothe themselves'. In Gen. 41/40, the verb-form יִשַּׁק ('shall kiss'), which is obviously unsuitable, must be an error for the resemblant יִשַּׁח ('shall bow down'). In Isa. 6/12 and 7/22, near the close in each case, בְּקֶרֶב should rather be בְּחֹרֶב, inasmuch as both passages treat of the land as d e s o l a t e through removal of the best of the inhabitants.

Through similarity of sound between ח and ש (cf. ח and ש also, ח and מ), transcribers have sometimes most infelicitously substituted one letter for the other. In Zech. 3/9, instead of וּמַשְׁתִּי, read וּמָחִיתִי ('and I shall wipe out' ; see Ps. 51/11 ; and cf, Isa. 43/25 ; 44/22 ;) in Ezek. 24/17

and 22, for אֲנָשִׁים read the unique Qal participle אֹנְחִים ('those who groan' (in grief)); in Ezek. 34/29, the impracticable expression לְשֵׁם מַטָּע ('a plantation for a name') is a strange mistranscription of מַטֵּה לֶחֶם ('the staff of bread'), which appears previously in 4/16; 5/16 and 14/13; In Jer. 26/10, the expression שָׂרֵי יְהוּדָה, to which the querying Noteline is prefixed, may be a mistranscription of חֹרֵי יְהוּדָה ('the nobles of Judah'). Ps. 41/9 for וַאֲשֶׁר read וְאַחַר (and (now) after that he has lain down). Possibly in Isa. 1/27 וְשָׁבֶר should be וְחֶבֶר. Isa. 35/7, of the unusual הַשָּׁרָב should rather be חָרֵב annex part of (the article is a posterior dittogram); also in Isa. 49/10 for שָׁרָב read חֹרֵב Ps. 68/10 for גְּשֶׁם read לֶחֶם b r e a d.

(i) ט As a dental, ט is apt to be mistaken for other letters of the same class; on its interchange with ד, see remarks on page 16.

On confusion of ט with צ, see Ps. 55/23, where מֹט ('tottering') should be מֹץ ('chaff'). Lev. 5/16, where חָטָא ('he hath sinned') should be הוֹצִיא ('he hath taken out'); see a similar error (in the feminine form of the verb) in verse 15; in Num. 17/11 הַקָּצֶף ('wrath') should rather be הַקֶּטֶב ('the pestilence'). ט sometimes seems even to be interchanged with the similarly sharp consonant, ק.

ט has been confounded with K. sounds. Thus, in Ezek. 7/23, for מִשְׁפַּט read מִשְׁפַּךְ shedding (of blood). I. Sam. 4/2 for וַתִּטֹּשׁ which does not suit the context, read וַתִּקֹּשׁ (and the battle was s e v e r e) (put ק for ט).

Further ט as a strong dental, approaches the sound of a sibilant, and is thus apt to be confounded with שׂ or שׁ; see I. Sam. 14/32, where the Massoretes have properly corrected וַיִּעַשׁ into וַיִּעַט ('and the people rushed'); Isa. 3/4, where מַעֲשֶׂה should be מַעֲטֶה ('covering' for the head, 'veil'); Job. 13/25, where נָטָה ('he inclineth') should be נָשָׂא ('he lifteth up'), as shown by ἦρηεν in the Septuagint.

Between ט and ת interchange is only natural; hence it is not strange to find the form יַחְטֹף in Ps. 10/9, and יַחְתֹּף in Job 9/12, both signifying 'he seizeth'. More troublesome interchanges of these two dentals appear in Amos 6/3, where שֶׁבֶת is an error for שֵׁבֶט ('rod'); in II Sam. 1/14, where לְשַׁחֵת should be לִשְׁחֹט ('to slay'); in Jer. 31/39, where יִנָּתֵשׁ should rather be יִנָּטֵשׁ so that, with the negative preceding the sense may become, ('shall not be deserted'). In Ps. 60/6, קֶשֶׁט ('truth') does not suit the context, and should either be קֶשֶׁת ('bow') as shown by the Septuagint (τόξον), or still better, קַשָּׁת ('archer').

(j) Cases in which י has been confused with א, ה, ו, and ח have been already given: see pages 7—11, 21.

More rarely has י been confused with ע: see Mal. 3/17, where לַיּוֹם should be לְעַם ('for a people', as in Deut. 14/2; 26/18) in Ps. 131/2 and Isa. 38/13, the troublesome form שִׁוִּיתִי must be corrected into שִׁוַּעְתִּי ('I cried'); In Ps. 80/5, for עָשַׁנְתָּ read יָשַׁנְתָּ ('thou sleepest').

(k) Similarity in sound between כ and ע has sometimes led to confusion in transcription. In Lev. 21/4, for the awkward term בַּעַל, read בְּכֹל ('in everything; כ & ע like עַל כָּל Zech. 12/2: for עַל יְהוּדָה read כָּל יְהוּדָה in Ps. 32/5, עָלַי, which produces an abnormal construction, should rather be כֹּל ('all') in Prov. 14/18 for יַכְתִּירוּ, read יַעֲתִירוּ ('they accumulate').

Naturally, כ and ק are frequently confused. In Isa. 38/17, instead of the disconcerting form חָשַׁקְתָּ ('thou hast dearly loved'), read חָשַׂכְתָּ ('thou hast preserved'), as attested by the Septuagint and the Vulgate; In Isa. 52/8 (at the beginning), for קוֹל, read כֹּל ('all'); in Jer 3/19, most probably מִכֹּל should be ('because of all'); in Ps. 50/18, חֶלְקְךָ ('thy portion') should rather be הָלַכְתָּ ('thou hast gone'); in II Sam. 13/13, for the unsuitable term תָּקוּם ('arise') restore the fitting form תִּכּוֹן ('be established'); in Ps. 25/3, at the

end, for the inappropriate form רֵיקָם ('vainly') read רָפִים ('weak ones'). Isa. 5/30 for חָשַׁךְ צַר, read חֶשְׁקַ יִצֹּר ('enjoyment he will restrain'). Isa. 8/12 for קֶשֶׁר read כֶּשֶׁר 'right'. Ps. 55/22: for וְקִרְבָּם לִבּוֹ, read וְחֶרֶב בְּלִבּוֹ ('but a sword (was) in his heart').

As the pronunciation of ל in Hebrew is unique, no confusion in sound between it and any other letter has taken place (cf. also ג below); because of its resemblance in form, however, to other characters, substitutions have occurred (see page 39—42).

Though מ and פ, as labial letters, are closely related, confusion between them, on the ground of similarity in sound, cannot be confidently established; more certainly however, they have been interchanged because of similarity in form (see page 113).

Like ל, the sound of כ is so different from that of other letters in the alphabet that confusion on this ground could hardly arise; because of its form, however, it has frequently been exchanged for other letters which it resembles (see page 24).

(l) the sharp sibilant ס has already been shown in interchange with ז, a kindred but milder sound: see page 20.

Instead of ס, the stronger צ sometimes occurs, as in Isa. 1/17, where the unworkable form חָמוּץ is a mistranscription of חָמוּס ('oppressed'), the Septuagint rendering rightly is ἀδικούμενον; similarly, in Ps. 71/4, for וְחוֹמֵץ, read וְחוֹמֵס ('and oppressor'); in Isa. 3/2. replace קוֹסֵם by קָצִין ('commander'); in Eccl. 6/2, instead of the unsuitable form חָסֵר ('needing') read עָצֵר ('restraining').

The peculiar sound of ס, though similar to that of שׁ must have been quite distinct from this,—so much so, indeed, that in Hebrew, till later times, when the difference in pronunciation became less marked, distinction in writing as well as in utterance was very carefully

maintained.[1] Hence, instances of confusion between these two letters are somewhat rare. and these are apparently due to transcribers in later times. Examples occur in I. Sam.12/14, where וְסַר should be וְשַׂר ('and captain', Septuagint ἄρχων) in Ezra 4/5 where וְסֹכְרִים should be וְשֹׂכְרִים ('and hiring'); in Isa, 22/23, לְכִסֵּא ('for a throne') should be לְנֹשֵׂא ('for one who bears'); further, סִכְלוּת ('folly') in Eccl. 2/3, 12, 13; 7/25; 10/1, 13 is miswritten שִׂכְלוּת in 1/17, in Ps. 42/5, for the unworkable form בַּסַּךְ read בַּשַּׂק ('in sackcloth') Ezek. 9/2, 3, 11; for קֻסֶּת read קֻשֶּׂת ('pot, or small bottle') Conversely, the usual form כַּעַס ('vexation'. or provocation') as in Prov. 17/25 etc. appears as כַּעַשׂ in Job. 5/2; 6/2 etc.; in II Sam. 1/22, נָשׂוֹג ('he drew back'), should be נָסוֹג, as in many MSS.; in Lam. 4/4, פֹּרֵשׂ should rather be פֹּרֵס ('breaking' (bread); in Hos. 9/12, for בְּשׂוּרִי read בְּסוּרִי ('when I turn away').

Somewhat strangely, ס is more frequently confused by transcribers with the stronger שׂ than with שׁ,[2] as in Ps. 71/21, where וְתִסֹּב should be וְתָשֹׁב as in the preceding verse twice. In Cant. 1/12, the questionable noun-form מְסִבּוֹ (alleged to mean 'his round table') should rather be מְשִׁבּוֹ ('his mansion'); in II. Sam. 6/20, is found the form וַיָּשָׂב ('and he returned'), while וַיָּסָב ('and he turned round') appears in the parallel passage, I. Chr. 16/43. Conversely, while the usual form of the term signifying 'a storm of wind' is סַעַר (Jon. 1/4, 12; Jer. 23/19; 25/32), or סְעָרָה (Isa. 29/6; Ps. 107/25 etc.), the former appears as שַׂעַר in Isa. 28/2, and the latter as שְׂעָרָה in Nah. 1/3, Job. 9/17. In Deut. 7/19, the unsuitable form הַמַּסֹּת ('the temptations') is most pro-

---

1) In Syriac, on the other hand, the distinction was not observed, as that ס alone remains in use.

2) On the other hand, in some communities and localities at least, the proper pronunciation of שׁ was lost, and that of ס survived: see the well known story of שִׁבֹּלֶת pronounced סִבֹּלֶת, Jud. 12/6.

bably a scribal error for הַמַּשְׁאֹת ('the devastations') : see also 4/34 ; 29/2. In II. Kings 19/29 there appears the form סָחִישׁ but שָׂחִישׁ in the parallel passage, Isa. 37/20.

On confusion of ס with ת which is often pronounced as a slight sibilant, see Num. 15/89, where תָּתוּרוּ should rather be תָּסוּרוּ ('turn aside'). Prov. 11/16, has t w o cases : תִּתְמֹךְ should be Niphal תִּסָּמֵךְ (shall be abundantly supplied with), יִתְמְכוּ should be יִסָּמְכוּ.

(m) The pronunciation of ע was sometimes slight ;[1] so that it became practically inaudible, and in some cases was omitted in writing, thus, בְּעִי ('entreaty') in course of time was shortened into בִּי, and came to be used as an interjected fragment (meaning 'pray !' or 'I beseech thee !'), as in Gen. 44/18 ; Ex. 4/10, 13 ; Num. 12/11 etc. In Ps. 28/8, לָמוֹ should be לְעַמּוֹ, as shown in the Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Vulgate, and in Ps. 29/11, where the correct reading appears. In Ex. 36/3, for וְהָם, read וְהָעָם ('and the people') ; in Isa. 48/1, for מִמֵּי ('from the waters') read מִמְּעֵי ('from the bowels') ; in Zech. 9/6, for וְהִכְרַתִּי ('and I will cut off'), read וְהִכְרַעְתִּי ('and I will bring low') ; in Mic. 1/10, for בְּכוֹ read בְּעַכּוֹ ('in Accho'). Similarly, בֵּל, the name of the Babylonian deity in Isa. 46/1 ; Jer. 50/2 ; 51/44, is contracted from בַּעַל (Hebrew, בַּעַל, 'Lord').

On the confusion of ע with א, see preceding remarks regarding this letter.

While it is perfectly certain that ע was sometimes confounded, in some communities and localities, with צ[2] one can hardly be certain, in every case, whether the exchange is due to similarity of sound rather than to similarity of form.[3]

---

1) In Arabic, there is both a weaker and a stronger pronunciation of this letter.

2) Consider the varying pronunciation of some letters in Arabic, in different countries.

3) This subject will receive attention later ; see page 100—104.

That the pronunciation of these letters, however, was closely resemblant is amply proved by Aramaic, which presents such forms as אַרַע (Dan. 2/36, 39 ; 3/31 etc.) for the Hebrew אֶרֶץ ; עֲמַר (Dan. 7/9) for the Hebrew צֶמֶר ('wool'), etc. To this cause possibly may be assigned the substitution, in I. Sam. 21/7, of הָרֹעִים ('the shepherds') for הָרָצִים ('the runners'); of עָרֶיךָ ('thy cities') in Hos. 13/10, for צָרֶיךָ ('thine adversaries') ; of the first מֵעִיר, in Isa. 25/2, for מָצוֹר ('citadels'). The converse substitution is seen in Ps. 68/17, where the unique and impracticable form תִּרְצְדוּ should be תִּרְעֲדוּ ('ye leap') ; In Job. 4/12, where שֶׁמֶץ should rather be שֶׁמַע ('sound').

When ע is pronounced firmly, it may be mistaken for a weakly uttered, א and conversely : An Aramaic illustration occurs in Jer. 10/11, where וְאַרְקָא stands for וּמֵאַרְעָא ('and the earth'). Hence, in II. Sam. 18/13, עָשִׂיתִי is most probably a transcriptional corruption of קָשַׁרְתִּי ('I have conspired') ; in Ps. 91/8, the opening form רַק ('only') is an obvious error for רַע ('evil'), and this must be restored to its proper original place at the end of verse 7, where it is required as the subject of the concluding clause, to give the meaning, 'no evil shall come nigh to thee' ; and the same change, if made in Ps. 32/6, would make the middle clause mean 'at a time when he finds evil'.

Confusion between the closely related sounds of ע and ר is of somewhat frequent occurrence. In Zeph. 1/10, a more suitable reading than וְשֶׁבֶר is וְשֶׁוַע ('and an outcry'). Noteworthy are instances of confusion between the resemblant verbs שָׁמַע ('hear') and שָׁמַר ('keep'), with their derivatives ; thus, in Ex. 24/7, at the end, for וְנִשְׁמָע, read וְנִשְׁמָר ; in II. Sam. 23/23, for מִשְׁמַעְתּוֹ read מִשְׁמַרְתּוֹ ('and his body-guard') ; conversely, in Prov. 15/5, for וְשֹׁמֵר read וְשֹׁמֵעַ ('but he who heareth'), In Deut. 11/22 for the expression אִם שָׁמוֹר תִּשְׁמְרוּן the rendering given by the Septuagint translator, ἐὰν ἀκοῇ

ἀκουσητε, shows that he read the verb-form as those of שָׁמַע; similar renderings appear in Deut. 19/9; 28/58; 31/12 etc. in Jer. 49/9 and Obad. 1/5, instead of בֹּצְרִים read בֹּצְעִים ('robbers'); in Ezek. 21/20, for מְעֻטָה read מְרֻטָה ('sharpened'); in Isa. 45/8, יֶשַׁע ('salvation') is less suited to the context, which treats of "righteousness", than יֹשֶׁר ('equity'). ע and ת rarely interchange, but in Ps. 78/31 הַכְרִיעַ is certainly an error הִכְרִית (cut off).

(n) Interchange of פ with ב and מ has already been considered; see pages 14—15.

(o) On the similarity of sound between צ and ז and ט respectively, see what has been already stated regarding these two letters, pages 20 and 23.

Naturally, צ is sometimes interchanged with שׂ or ש as being sibilants. Illustrations are presented by the verb-forms צָחַק and שָׂחַק, which may be used indifferently to convey the same meaning ('to laugh'), though the former appears mostly in Genesis (18/12, 13, 15; 17/17; 21/6 etc.) while the latter, more softly pronounced, occurs very frequently elsewhere (Jud. 16/25, 27; Job. 5/22; 29/24; 30/1 etc.) Positive confusion, causing considerable difference in meaning, is seen on comparing לְהָשִׁיב ('to restore') in II. Sam. 8/3, with לְהַצִיב ('to establish'), which appears in the parallel passage, I.Chr. 18/3; in Hos. 5/11 (at end) צָו which is quite inappropriate, must be an error for שָׁוְא ('wickedness'); in Ps. 17/9 שַׁדּוּנִי may safely be regarded as a mistranscription of צָדּוּנִי ('they lie in wait for me'). In Isa. 9/10, for צָרֵי read שָׂרֵי, in as much as the context requires mention, not of Pekin's "adversaries", but his (military) "officers". The proposed substitute actually occurs in many Hebrew MSS. Ps. 68/15 for בְּפָרֵשׂ which is too mild בִּפְרֹץ.

(p) The confusion naturally arising between ק and כ had already been noted on page 24.

(q) Mistakes arising from similarity of sound between

ר and ע have already been instanced: see page 28.

(r) Regarding errors caused by similarity in the sound of ז and שׁ to that of שׂ, see page 20.

Between שׁ and שׂ themselves, confusion naturally arose, particularly in early times, when the distinguishing point had not been applied. To this cause may be assigned the twofold error at the end of Jer. 8/10, where עֹשֶׂה שֶׁקֶר ('a perpetrator of falsehood') should rather be עֹשְׁקֵי שָׂכִיר ('defrauders of the hireling'). In Isa. 19/13, for נִשְּׁאוּ ('they have been deceived'), the Septuagint translator shows, by his rendering, (ὑψώθησαν) that he read the Hebrew as נִשְׂאוּ ('they are lifted up'): in Mic. 2/8. שִׂלְמָה ('outer garment') has obviously been taken as שְׁלֹמֹה ('his peace' εἰρήνη αὐτοῦ). In Prov. 29/6, for בְּפֶשַׁע ('in transgression'), read בְּפִשְׁעֵי ('in the footsteps'); in Job 19/8, for חֹשֶׁךְ ('darkeness'), read חֹשֶׁךְ ('a barrier'). Confusion has also been made between forms of נָגַשׂ ('to oppress') and נָגַשׁ ('to approach'): see Amos 6/3.

(s) On confusion of ת with other dentals, see above pages 20, 24, 37.

That שׁ or שׂ should be confounded with ת will not seem strange when it is borne in mind that in early times, as still among some Jewish communities, ת was pronounced as a slight sibilant[1]. cf. Eng. W a t e r and Ger. W a s s̈ e r. Illustrations occur in Cant. 1/17 where בְּרוֹתִים is found instead of בְּרוֹשִׁים ('cypress trees'); in Jer. 36/22, where וְאֵת הָאָח should be וְאֵשׁ הָאָח ('and the fire on the brazier'); see Prov. 12/26. where יָתֵר should be the Piel verb-form יַשֵּׁר ('directeth', 'keepeth right'); in Job. 34/20, where יָמֻתוּ ('they die'), queried by the Note-line, is too strong a term when viewed in relation to the context, and must rather be יָמֹשׁוּ

---

[1] Here also is felt the influence of the Aramaic, which shows תְּעַר for שַׁעַר ('gate'), תּוּב for שׁוּב ('return') etc; cf. also שֶׁתֶל and שֶׁגֶל with the Arabic m i t h l and s h a l j.

('they give away'); in Amos 5/2, where the predicate applied in the Massoretic Text to the virgin of Israel, viz. נִטְּשָׁה ('she is forsaken'), is hardly suitable, and must doubtless be regarded as a mistranscription of נִטְתָּה ('she lieth stretched out' at full length); in Ps. 31/24, for יֶתֶר ('abundance') read יֹשֶׁר ('justice')[1]; in Job 21/7, the verb-form עָתְקוּ should rather be עָשְׁקוּ, 'they violently practice extortion', and the cognate noun עשק should be substituted for עָתָק in I. Sam 2/3; Ps. 31/19; 75/6; 94/4. Ex. 32/16 for חָרוּת read the normal חָרוּשׁ 'incised', 'cut in').

5. CASES IN WHICH SUBSTITUTION OF MORE THAN ONE LETTER HAS OCCURRED.

Having thus considered, in detail, the more important conditions under cases in which a single letter in a word has been changed, and has thus produced a change of meaning, we are in position to consider, with some confidence, instances in which more than one letter has been changed, through similarity of sound.

In Ps. 113/4 exception may well be taken to the Massoretic reading in the first clause, stating that "the Lord is high above all nations"; and the old scribe was fully justified in inserting the querying Note-line after the last term; but when we consider the thought presented in the second half of the verse (which forms a parallel to the first) viz. "His glory is above the heavens", there is sufficient reason for holding that גוֹיִם is a transcriptional error for עָבִים ('clouds'). In Zach. 10/7, describing the joy of restored Israel, the two verb-forms וְהָיוּ ('and they shall

---

[1] See D. B. Macdonald on the 'Interchange of Dentals and Sibilants in Semitic' (Amer. Journal of Semitic. Vol. XV pp. 100 & ff.

be') and יִרְאוּ ('they shall see'), each of which presents too mild a meaning for the context, ought surely to be the resemblants וְחָדוּ ('and they shall rejoice, be glad'), and יָרִיעוּ ('they shall shout for joy') respectively. In Zach. 1/6, one does not feel satisfied with the statement that the statutes which the Lord commanded through the former prophets "overtook" the fathers of those to whom Zachariah's words were addressed, but if the verb-form הִשִּׂיגוּ be regarded as an error for the resemblant חָשְׂכוּ ('restrained'), a fitting meaning is obtained. In Ex. 14/21, describing the passage of the Israelites through the Red sea, the verb-form וַיּוֹלֶךְ ('and he caused to go') queried by the Note-line, should rather be וַיַּחֲלֹק, which makes the clause in which it stands to mean, "and the Lord divided the sea". In Num. 14/25, מָחָר ('to-morrow') is proved, by examination of verses 44,45, to be a mistaken substitute for וּבָהָר ('and in the mountain'), which was held by the Amalekites and Canaanites. In Num. 25/4, the expression רָאשֵׁי הָעָם ('the heads' (or 'leading men') of the people'), is surely a transcriber's error for רִשְׁעֵי הָעָם ('the guilty ones of the people'), who alone had incurred the penalty of death. In Ps. 66/4, it is somewhat strange to find the verb-form וְיַזַּמְּרוּ ('and they shall sing') construed with a dative, and then, almost immediately after, a like form of the same verb followed by an accusative; a more likely reading than the first form would be וְיִשְׁמְעוּ ('and they shall obey' (or 'give ear')). Ps. 58/10 for אָטָד read עָתִיד (ready, prepared). Isa. 7/17 for בָּאוּ לְמִיּוֹם, read בַּעֲלוּ מִיּוֹם (have been masters from the day). Ps. 57/3 is awkwardly and even incomprehensibly divided by the familiar form סֶלָה; but if this be regarded as merely a transcriptional error for the absolute infinitive שָׁלַח prefixed to the finite form immediately following, difficulty at once disappears; for the latter half of the verse now runs thus, "God shall certainly send forth His kindness and His truth" (Deut. 6/19; 7/18 etc.)

In Deut. 16/5 and 17/2, there is found the expression בְּאַחַד שְׁעָרֶיךָ ('in one of thy gates') which, on close examination in the light of the context, appears less suitable than a similarly sounded expression בְּאַחַת עָרֶיךָ ; and this is actually attested by the Septuagint (ἐν ὑιᾶ των πόλεων σου, in one of thy cities). Similar emendations are required in Gen. 22/17 ; 24/60. One of the most instructive instances of mistakes bearing on the part of a transcriber appears in Ezek. 34/30, where מַטָּע לְשֵׁם ('a plantation for a name') is promised by the Lord to his restored people, so that they would no more be consumed with hunger ; difficulty, however, disappears when restoration is made of the similarly sounded figurative expression מַטֵּה לֶחֶם ('the staff of bread'), which occurs thrice earlier in the same book (viz. 4/16 ; 5/16 ; 14/13). The unique form הַסְכֵּת (rightly marked by the Note-line) in Deut. 27/9 shows a remarkable substitution, by an early transcriber, of these similarly sounded consonants, and should obviously be הַשְׁקֵט ('be quiet'). Joel 1/7 וְהִשְׁלִיךְ, which gives no appropriate meaning, ought to be וְכִשְׁלֶג "and like snow". In Exod. 14/21, a more appropriate reading than וַיּוֹלֶךְ ('and he led away') is the resemblant וַיַּחֲלֹק ('and he divided'). It is hardly probable that, in Deut. 20/14, the Israelites should be commanded to "eat" the spoil of their enemies ; hence, instead of וְאָכַלְתָּ substitution should be made of וְלָקַחְתָּ ('and thou shalt take') or וְחָלַקְתָּ ('and thou shalt divide'). Jer. 48/2 for תֵּדֶל read תְּדֻלַּק.

The observant scribe who long ago inserted the Note-line in Ps. 8/3 before יוֹנְקִים ('sucklings') evidently deemed this term unsuited to the context ; the resemblant חֲנוּכִים ('boys who are being instructed') certainly seems more appropriate ; in view of the context עֻזְּךָ ('thy strength'), 63/3, seems less fitting than the resemblant הוֹדְךָ ('thy grandeur'). In Ex. 4/31, where the received form וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ ('and they heard') is represented in the Old Greek Version by καὶ ἐχάρη, this

rendering obviously points to the resemblant וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ ('and they rejoiced'), which is much better suited to the context. In Num. 18/5, קֶצֶף ('fierce wrath') should probably be קֶטֶב ('pestilence') in view of what is recorded in the preceding narrative (17/11-11/46 in English).

Isa. 51/1 seems to require a number of emendations. First, it is not likely that the imperative לְכוּ ('go ye') was repeated thrice ; one may rather believe that in the second instance a transcriber unconsciously substituted the form for the somewhat unusual imperative לְקָחוּ ('take ye'), Ex. 29/1 ; Prov. 20/16 ; Ezek. 37/16, less probably לִקּוּ ('lap ye'), Jud. 7/5, 6, 7. Next, the twice repeated form שִׁבְרוּ, with which is associated the idea of purchase (see Gen. 41/57 ; 42/2, 3, 5, 7, 10 ; 43/2, 4, 22, 25, etc.) contradicts the context, which declares that food and drink are to be had without money ; the genuine reading, at both points, seems to be the resemblant שִׂבְעוּ ('be satisfied') ; see the cognate noun in the middle of verse 2. Thirdly, as mention of bread is not made till the second verse, the imperative וְאִכְלוּ ('and eat') comes prematurely, and is most probably a corruption of the resemblant וְהִקָּהֲלוּ ('and gather yourselves together') see Ex. 32/1 ; Lev. 8/4 ; Num. 16/3 ; 20/2, etc.

6. ERRORS DUE TO SUBSTITUTION OF LETTERS SIMILAR IN FORM.

Many are the mistakes caused through substitution of Letters similar in form. These errors were obviously committed in looking at the older script from which the new copy was being made. The main share of the blame, however, may lie with the previous scribe, who failed to write distinctly, and did not clearly differentiate between resemblant letters. Sometimes, however, the material—usually

skins—on which the pattern texts were written had become worn through frequent use, and the writing accordingly indistinct. Conscientious scribes would do their best to transmit what seemed the genuine text, but errors would creep in, despite the care exercised to avoid these.

Investigation of this class of errors demands careful examination, not merely of the modern Hebrew alphabet, but also of all others in which the Old Testament Scriptures, in whole or in part, were at any time transcribed. Epigraphical study in these lines often leads quickly to a satisfactory solution of difficulties in the Massoretic Text. Convenient tables presenting the different alphabets in parallel columns are now readily accessible.[1] The order of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet will be observed in examining this division of the substitutions which have taken place.

(a) Confusion of א with resemblants in form.

Of the instances in which א has given place to ב, one occurs in I. Sam. 31/9, where בֵּית is certainly an error for אֶת as attested by the parallel passage in I. Chr. 11/9, and even by the correct construction in the clause succeeding ; in I. Sam. 14/27, וַיָּשֶׁב ('and he returned') should rather be וַיִּשָּׂא ('and he raised') ('his hand to his mouth'). Conversely, in Hos. 7/16, as suggested by Nowack, לֹא עַל should be

---

[1] The simple page prefixed to many editions of Gesenius Grammar, or Euting's table in Bickell's Outlines of Hebrew Grammar London 1877, will be found very convenient. Fuller tables are presented in the works of such skilled Epigraphists as M. Lidzbarski (Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphits, Weimar, 1898), and G. A. Cooke (Text-book of North Semitic Inscriptions, Oxford, 1903) ; the magnificent collection in the Corpus Inscriptiorum Semiticarum issued by the French Government, may be found overwhelming, and is not always accessible. The Cambridge Ancient History 1924—5 Vol. II. III.

לַבַּעַל ('to Baal'). In Isa. 5/19, וְתִקְרַב ('and let it draw near') may more appropriately be read as וְתִקָּרֵא ('and let it be proclaimed'). Ps. 72/10 יָשִׁיבוּ ('they shall bring back') should certainly be (see context) יִשְׁאוּ 'they shall bring'.

In several of the Semitic alphabets, an imperfectly formed א resembles ג, so that one might readily be mistaken for the other. Instances occur in Isa. 42/4 where, for אִיִּים ('coasts' or 'islands') the Septuagint rendering ἔθνη points to a better reading, viz. גּוֹיִם ('nations'); in 53/10 where אִם should rather be גַּם ('even'); in Zach. 11/3, where אַדַּרְתָּם ('their glory') is less appropriate than גְּדֻרָתָם, in as-much as the passage mentions the yelling of shepherds when 'their sheepfold' is destroyed; in Zach. 4/7, where וְהוֹצִיא ('and he shall bring forth') is less appropriate than its resemblant וְהִצִּיג ('and he shall lay'), since the object in the clause is the chief stone laid by Zerubbabel at the building of the Second Temple. Conversely, in Jer. 12/6, the third גַּם should rather be אִם, so that the clause which it begins may mean 'if they cry after thee'; and in Amos 5/15, וְהַצִּיגוּ ('and establish') should rather be וְהוֹצִיאוּ ('and they bring forth') as in Ps. 37/6; Isa. 42/1, 3. Ps. 83/9 for אַשּׁוּר (most unlikely) read גְּשׁוּר 'small adjacent region'.

Between the forms of א and ד there is considerable resemblance in some Aramean inscriptions: this may help to explain why, in Jer. 9/2, the unsuitable form וַיִּדְרְכוּ appears instead of וַיַּאֲרִיכוּ ('and they extend'); and why, in Prov. 24/2,[1] the form שׁד (fully written שׁוד) is represented in the Greek translation by ψεῦδος, a meaning of שָׁוְא ('falsehood') which is more suited to the context; in Hos. 10/14, the unworkable form וְקָאם may be a mistranscription of יִקֹּדֶם ('shall confront'); and in Isa. 65/23, as Perles has shown

---

[1] See Lagard's remarks on this passage (Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien . . . . 1863.

(Analecta, p. 50) the inappropriate term יֵלְדוּ ('they shall bring forth') must have originally been יִלְאוּ ('they shall grow weary'), as required by the context. In order to obtain support for attaching to the unique construct form אֶרֶשֶׁת the meaning of 'desire', in Ps. 20/3 as obviously required by the context, lexicographers have looked for support to the Arabic or the Assyrian, but the substitution of an obsolete form דְּרֶשֶׁת would more easily give the same result in Hebrew.

The forms of א and מ, in the Neo-Punic alphabet, show such decided similarity that substitution of one for the other is not surprising. In Jer. 31/7, for בָּם read בָּא ('there cometh') in II. Chr. 30/15, for נִכְלְמוּ ('were ashamed') read נִכְלְאוּ ('shut themselves up'). and similarly, in Num. 12/14, for תִּכָּלֵם read תִּכָּלֵא ; in Ruth 2/15, for תַּכְלִימוּהָ read תִּכְלְאוּהָ ('restrain her') ; in Ps. 7/4, for זֹאת read זִמָּה ('a wicked deed'), as suggested by Grätz ; in Jud. 14/15 (e n d), for הֲלֹא (N o u n e) read הֲלֹם ('hither'). Because of similarity, o m i s s i o n of one of these letters, when contiguous, is natural; in Isa. 40/11, for יִשָּׂא read יִשָּׂאם.

Similarity of form between א and נ is not so marked in some old Semitic alphabets as to have occasioned much interchange between them, yet several passages prove the confusion. For כַּאֲשֶׁר in Ps. 56/7 it is more appropiate to read כְּנֶשֶׁר, so as to obtain the fitting close ('like an eagle they lie in wait for my life'). In Gen. 29/27, וְנִתְּנָה should be וְאֶתְּנָה, as attested by the Septuagint καὶ δώσω ('and I shall give') ; in Isa. 56/12, instead of the singular אֶקְחָה, substitute the plural נִקְחָה ('let us take'), that this may harmonise with the succeeding plural form נִסְבְּאָה ; in Isa. 58/14, instead of וְהַאֲכַלְתִּיךָ ('and I will cause thee to eat') read וְהִנְחַלְתִּיךָ ('and I will cause thee to inherit') ; in Zach. 3/4, instead of עֲוֹנֶךָ ('thine iniquity') restore צוֹאֶיךָ ('thy filthy garments'), as required by the context.

Little resemblance subsists between א and ס, yet in

Isa. 41/25 וְיָבֹא seems, from the parallel following, to be a mistranscription of וְיָבֹס ('and he shall trample on'). Certainly, in Ps. 36/12, תְּבוֹסֵנִי should be תְּבוֹאֵנִי 't r a m p l e on me'.

As in the preceding case, the forms of א and פ do not present close resemblance, yet one of them has occasionnally been mistaken for the other; as in Lev. 5/22, where the expression לַחֲטֹא בָהֶנָּה, which is too mild to suit the succeeding context, should rather be לַחֲטֹף מְאוּמָה ('by snatching away anything'), and similarly, in verse 23, יֶחֱטָא should be חָטַף ('has snatched'); in Zach. 14/9, twice, for אֶחָד read פַּחַד ('terror'); in Prov. 28/18, בְּאַחַת ('at once') is probably an error, as suggested by Grätz, for בְּפַחַת ('into a pit').

Even in modern Hebrew characters, the tops of א and צ are similar, so that one of these might readily be mistaken for the other. See Ps. 27/1, where אוֹרִי ('my light') — observe the Note-line—should rather be צוּרִי ('my rock'), as the Psalmist's theme is the Lord as His Protector in the midst of his enemies; Isa. 42/15, where לְאִיִּים ('to islands') should rather be לְצִיָּה ('to desert land') as required by the context; Ps. 106/5, where לִרְאוֹת ('to see')—at which the Note-line has been placed—should rather be לִרְצוֹת ('to delight in'); Exod. 16/29, where the mild imperative רְאוּ should rather be רְצוּ ('be pleased'); Isa. 1/13, where the Septuagint translator, by his rendering νηστεῖον, shows that he read אָוֶן as צוֹם ('fasting'). Ps. 28/1 for צוּרִי read אוֹרִי 'my light', other words to be corrected to suit l i g h t. Isa. 57 11 for תְּכַזְּבִי read תֵּכְאֲבִי ('thou wast in sorrow').

Though there is no very close resemblance, in any of the Semitic alphabets, between א and ק, these letters were sometimes mistaken, the one for the other. Thus, in Job. 6/8, parallelism requires that תִּקְוָתִי ('my expectation') should rather be תַּאֲוָתִי ('my desire'); in Ps. 32/6, עֵת מְצֹא ('a time of finding') should rather be עֵת מָצוֹק ('a time of

distress'); in Isa. 45/20, הַנֹּשְׂאִים ('those who carry') is less suited to the context than הַנֹּשְׁקִים ('those who kiss'); in Ps. 55/19, for מִקֶּרֶב, read מֵאֹרֵב ('from him who lay in wait'). Ps. 36/10 for מְקוֹר read מְאוֹר (luminary).

Between א and a ר also there has sometimes been comparison. See Josh. 19/47, where the confusion וַיֵּצֵא מֵהֶם ('and it (viz. the territory assigned to Dan) went out from them') must surely be a mistranscription for וַיֵּצֶר מֵהֶם ('for it was too confined for them'); in Num. 31/23 (t w i c e), the mild term יָבֹא ('can enter') ought rather to be יִטְּהַר ('can be purified'); in Amos 7/1, for יוֹצֵר ('he formed'), read rather יוֹצֵא ('there came forth'). א and ש confused. Ps. 36/13 for שָׁם read אִם (If).

In the Samaritan alphabet especially, not to speak of other Semitic characters, the forms of א and ת are so strikingly similar that confusion between them is anything but strange. Thus, in Jer. 3/8 (at the beginning), the form וָאֵרֶא makes no sense, but if we substitute וַתֵּרֶא, as indicated in the Vulgate and the Syriac ('and she saw'), the verse runs smoothly; in Jer. 21/12, containing the clause, 'lest mine ire go forth like fire', the verb-form תֵּצֵא should rather be תֵּצַת, which will give the meaning, 'lest mine ire be kindled like fire'; Ex. 22/5 requires a like correction; similarly, in Hab. 3/5, for וַיֵּצֵא read וַיִּצַּת ('and burned'); in Jer. 5/1, אִישׁ אִם should rather be אִישׁ תָּם ('an upright man'); in I. Sam. 17/52, the indefinite term גַּיְא ('a ravine') is doubtless a transcriptional error for גַּת ('Gath') as indicated by the Septuagint (Γέθ) and shown by the context, which tells of the Philistines and another of their cities, Ekron. In Ps. 31/3 appears the form לְבִית, while the parallel in Ps. 71/3 לָבוֹא is found.

(b) As ב, if badly formed at certain points, might resemble ג, one of these two letters, might, in some MSS. be mistaken for the other. Among the somewhat rare

occurrences, see Ezek. 43/13, where the first of the two terms in the expression גַּב הַמִּזְבֵּחַ ('the back of the altar'); should rather be גַּג ('the roof-surface') as shown by the correct expression in Ex. 30/3 and 37/26; also Ps. 78 47, where יַהֲרֹג should doubtless be changed to יַחֲרִיב, a verb-form which is more appropriate than the other to express the destruction of vines. In I. Sam. 14/26, מַשִּׁיג is acknowledged (by Klostermann, Weir & Driver), on the testimony of the Septuagint (ἐπιστρέφων) and the Targum (מְתִיב) to be a transcriptional error for מֵשִׁיב; this is also proved by the finite form וַיָּשֶׁב in the next verse. In Jer 31/31, בָּעַלְתִּי ('I was lord') is represented in the Septuagint by ἠμέλησα (which is a natural rendering of גָּעַלְתִּי, 'I rejected'); see also Heb. 8/9.

That ב, if carelessly formed, might seem rather to be ד, becomes evident on examining the Semitic Alphabets. Substitution of one letter for the other solves the difficulties found in Prov. 29/2, where בִּרְבוֹת ('abound') is obviously an error fo בִּרְדוֹת ('rule'), an idea confirmed by the parallel in the second half of the verse; in Ps. 69/11, where the unsuitable form וָאֶבְכֶּה ('and I wept') should rather be וָאֶדַכֶּה ('and I crushed'); in Prov. 10/32, where יֵדְעוּן ('know'), must be changed to יַבִּיעוּן ('pour forth'), as Grätz ingeniously suggests. Rashi held that instead of the inappropriate reading אַבְנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה ('stones of the field') in Job. 5/23, אֲדֹנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה, must have been the original reading. Ps. 17/14 מֵחֶלֶז might rather be מֵחֶלֶב 'from the fat' (best), Jer. 2/12 for חָרֲבוּ, read חָרְדוּ be filled with dread (to suit the context).

That ב and ה, in some Semitic alphabets, when badly formed may be mistaken, one for the other, will be obvious when the two are compared. Examples of the confusion are found in II. Sam. 19/32, where the Kethib is בַּיַּרְדֵן while the Qeri is הַיַּרְדֵּן; in Num. 23/3 where יִקָּרֶה, should be יִקָּרֵב ('will draw near'); in Hos. 7/8, where עֻגָה ('a cake')

should be עֹגֵב ('lusting'); in Ex. 11/1, where כָּלָה should rather be כֶּלֶב ('a dog').

Between ב and ח, in later Semitic alphabets, there is some resemblance of form, so that mistranscription was more than possible. On this ground, in Deut. 33/29, where יְכַחֲשׁוּ (which has been variously rendered, 'they shall be found liars', 'they shall feign obedience', 'they shall submit themselves') should be changed to יִכָּבְשׁוּ ('they shall be subdued'), which is also the form to be similarly restored, instead of the inappropriate Piel יְכַחֲשׁוּ, in Ps. 18/45; 63/3; 81/15. In Ps. 9/18, instead of the inapposite term יָשׁוּבוּ ('they shall be turned'), read יָשׁוּחוּ ('they shall sink down'); similarly, in Ps. 74/21, for יָשֹׁב, read יָשַׁח ('let him not sink down'). Ps. 68/16, for לָנֶצַח ('forever'), which contradicts the distinctive meaning of יִשְׁכֹּן, read לְנָצִיב (as a director or overseer).

As ב and ט show but slight resemblance at a few points, and this in only some of the Semitic alphabets, cases in which confusion has taken place between these two letters are comparatively rare. In Ex. 32/27, however, וְשׁוּבוּ ('and return') seems an erroneous reading for וְשׁוּטוּ ('and run to and fro'); in Lev. 5/1, for תְּחֻטָּא ('sinneth'), we must surely restore תֶּחְבָּא ('is in hiding'), as required by the context; in Isa. 23/8, as Tyre was eminently a centre of commerce, through which commodities were carried from one country to another, the unique and perplexing Hiphil participle הַמַּעֲטִירָה ('that crowneth') applied to the city, must surely give place to its more apposite resemblant הַמַּעֲבִירָה ('that transporteth').

Between ב and י there is little resemblance in form in any of the Semitic alphabets, yet some cases of substitution appear. In Hos. 2/14, instead of לְיַעַר ('for a forest'), substitute לְבָעֵר ('to be consumed') (cf. Isa. 5/5); in Zach. 14/5, the questionable expression גֵּי הָרִים ('the ravine of the mountains')

should rather be גֵּב הָרִים ('the ridge of the mountains'); in Exod. 28/42, יְרֵכַיִם ('thighs') may probably be an error for בִּרְכַּיִם ('knees'). In Ps. 31/13, כִּכְלִי ('like a vessel') should perhaps rather be כְּכֶלֶב ('like a dog').

Between ב and כ[1] there is obviously much interchange in the modern characters, as well as in the Egyptian Aramaic and the Palmyrene (see the tables); only a few illustrations need be given. In I. Sam. 11/6, for the Kethib בְּשָׁמְעוֹ ('when he heard') the Qeri is כְּשָׁמְעוֹ; in verse 7, similarly, בְּחֹם is corrected into כָּחֹם, see also Josh. 4/18; 6/15; Zach. 2/6, etc. In Isa. 66/15, for בָּאֵשׁ ('with fire'), the Septuagint rendering, ὡς πῦρ, shows that the translator read the form before him as כָּאֵשׁ ('like fire'); conversely, in Ps. 78/69, for כָּאָרֶץ ('like the earth'), he read בָּאָרֶץ, as shown by the corresponding expression, ἐν εῇ γῇ; in Ps. 10/9, the first יֶאֱרֹב ('he lieth in wait') should be יֶאֱרַךְ ('he waiteth long'); in II. Sam. 1/21, for בְּלִי, read כְּלִי, that the expression which it begins may be rendered 'the weapon of him who was anointed'; in Ps. 10/15, for the negative בַּל, which does not readily fit into the context, read כֹּל ('everything'). In Ps. 32/3, the Massoretes, by fixing for us the verb-form בָּלוּ, represent the writer as saying that his eyes were being 'worn out'; but many Manuscripts, giving the form כָּלוּ present a slightly different idea (were being 'consumed'). Ps. 69/28 יָבֹאוּ, should be יִרְאוּ (faint-hearted) or יִכָּלְאוּ (be deterred).

The form כָּל עַצְמוֹתָי ('my bones') in Ps. 22/18 produces too close a repetition of what is previously given in verse 15; but desirable variation may be secured through substitution of the resemblant עַצְבוֹתָי ('my pains').

As ב and ל show considerable resemblance in some of the more modern Semitic alphabets, substitution of one

---

[1] Let it be remembered that the final form (ך) of this letter, like the finals of מ, נ, צ and פ, is of comparatively late origin.

for the other is only to be expected. In II. Sam. 19/1, for בְּלֶכְתּוֹ ('as he went away'), we should probably read בִּבְכִתּוֹ ('and he wept'), as attested by the Septuagint (ἐν τῷ κλαίειν αὐτόν) ; both in Ps. 124,1, and Jon. 1/17 ('to us') the Septuagint rendering is ἐν ἡμῖν (i. e. בָּנוּ 'in us') ; in Jud. 11/39, לָהּ ('to her') is represented in the Greek by ἐν αὐτῇ (i. e. בָּהּ) ; In Num. 31/8, where it is stated that the petty kings defeated by the Israelites were slain on their respective territories, instead of חַלְלֵיהֶם, חַבְלֵיהֶם is surely the genuine reading ; in Jer. 7/10, instead of the questionable form נִצַּלְנוּ ('we have been delivered'), נִצַּבְנוּ ('we have been appointed') should be read. In several cases, various forms of the verb דָּבַק ('cleave to' or 'cling') have been erroneously substituted for the less frequent דָּלַק ('to burn, flame ; pursue hotly') : see Gen. 31/23 ; Jud. 18/22 ; 20/45 ; I. Sam. 14/22 ; II. Sam. 1/6 ; Jer. 41/16 etc.

The sense of a well known passage, Isa. 7/15, has been seriously affected in consequence of this substitution. A simple rendering of the Massoretic Text is that of the Authorised English Version, which states regarding the child Immanuel, 'Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good', but one may pertinently ask how the eating of this food would enable him to make this discernment, and an important step towards the solution of the difficulty is taken when we further ask w h e n the child would be able to eat butter and honey ? A glance onwards to verses 21,22 shows that the abundance of such food did not become possible till some years a f t e r most of the inhabitants had been deported to Assyria, and the land was in great measure left desolate ; by that time, the infant had become a lad (נַעַר, see V. 16) and thus reached the stage of intelligence when he could distinguish between evil and good. By changing the misleading form לְדַעְתּוֹ (unfortunately conformed by the Septua-

gint) in the middle of verse 15, to the resemblant בְּדַעְתּוֹ, the meaning at the crucial point is altered from 'that he may know' to the obviously appropriate sense 'when he knows'.

Besides their similarity in sounds, (see p. 15), ב and מ show resemblance of form[1] in several of the Semitic alphabets; hence the frequency with which one has been exchanged for the other: see Isa. 15, containing a prophecy against Moab, in which one of its cities is first called דִּבוֹן (v. 2), but afterwards דִּמוֹן (ver. 9). In Isa. 53/2, מֵאֶרֶץ ('out of the ground') has been read as בְּאֶרֶץ by the Septuagint Translator, whose rendering is ἐν γῇ; in Jon. 2/3, מִצָּרָה ('out of distress') is represented in the Septuagint by ἐν θλίψει, i. e. בְּצָרָה; conversely, in Obad. /21, בְּהַר ('in Mount') should probably be מֵהַר ('out of Mount'), as testified by ἐξ ὄρους in the Greek Version; in Ex. 14/28, for בָּהֶם, read מֵהֶם (ἐξ αὐτῶν); in Prov. 10/21, the Greek translator has read רַבִּים ('many') as רָמִים, his rendering being ὑψηλά. In Isa. 11/15, the opening term וְהֶחֱרִים ('and he shall utterly destroy') should be וְהֶחֱרִיב ('and he shall dry up'), inasmuch as the reference is to an arm of the sea which was to be rendered fit for men to cross dryshod.

The forms of ב and נ, in some Semitic alphabets, are at some points so similar as to have given rise to many mistranscriptions. In Zach. 10/8, וְרָבוּ ('and they shall increase') should rather be וְרָנּוּ ('and they shall shout'), as shown by the context; in Zach. 12/8, אֲבַקֵּשׁ ('I shall seek') may more fitly be replaced by אֲנַקֵּשׁ ('I will lay snares'); in Prov. 17/26, the form נְדִיבִים ('princes') may well give place to נָדוֹנִים ('those contending'); and it is generally agreed that the form בּוֹקֵר ('herdsman') in Amos 7/14 should be נוֹקֵד ('sheep-raiser') as indicated by the plural form in 1/1. In Ps. 21/12, instead of the unworkable verb-form נָטוּ ('they

---

[1] But see also page 49 foot-note.

inclined') or ('stretched out'), substitute the resemblant נָטוּ, which makes the clause mean 'they flippantly spoke evil regarding thee'.

In the modern Hebrew characters ב and ס are anything but resemblant; in Palmyrene writing, however, they are nearly identical: hence, in Hag. 1/4, the indefinite term חָרֵב ('laid waste') ('destroyed'), applied to the Temple in Jerusalem, might be regarded as a transcriptional error for the more specific term הָרֵס ('in ruins'; cf. Isa. 14/17; II. Sam. 11/25; Mal. 1/4 etc.); similarly, in Jer. 50/21, חֳרֹב may be a misreading of הֳרֹס ('lay in ruins') and in Amos 7/9, for יֶחֱרָבוּ, which seems too mild a term, read יֶהֱרְסוּ ('shall be laid in ruins').

The forms of ב and ע are closely resemblant in the Palmyrene characters, though likeness is difficult to discern in other Semitic alphabets; confusion between these two letters has sometimes occurred. At the end of Ps. 37/35, the questionable expression כְּאֶזְרָח רַעֲנָן (A. V. 'like a green bay-tree', R. V. paraphrastically! 'like a green tree in its native soil') is probably a mistranscription of כְּאַרְזֵי הַלְּבָנוֹן, as indicated in the Septuagint (ὡς τὰς κέδρους τοῦ Λιβάνου). In Ps. 69/36, where (as also in the verse following) mention is made of building the cities of Judah, so that men may dwell in them and hold them in possession, one does not expect to find this statement that God 'will save' Zion; indeed, an old scribe has inserted a Note-line before the suspected verb-form יוֹשִׁיעַ; if this, however, be changed to יוֹשִׁיב ('shall cause to be inhabited'), a more appropriate meaning is obtained. In Num. 11/31, the inappropriate verb-form נָסַע ('moved'), to which the Note-line has been affixed should be replaced by נָשַׁב, which makes the smooth reading 'a wind blew from the presence of the Lord'. Ps. 76/13. The opening form יִבְצֹר is inappropriate, and should be יַעְצֹר (retain, curb).

The similarity in sound between ב, and פ, as labials, has already been noted and illustrated[1]; but as they are similar in f o r m, additional instances of their interchanges will now be cited; it must always remain uncertain whether the confusion is due to one cause or the other. In II. Sam. 10/16, the name of the Syrian general is given as שׁוֹבַךְ, whereas שׁוֹפָךְ appears in the parallel passage, I. Chr. 19/15; in Ps. 68/31, instead of the questionable form בְּזַר, the resemblant פְּזַר ('scatter thou') should be substituted; in Prov. 11/28, for יִפּוֹל ('he shall fall'), read יִבּוֹל ('he shall fade'), in view of the succeeding context, as suggested by Dyserinck; in Job. 15/23, for בְּיָדוֹ ('in his hand') read פִּידוֹ ('his doom'); in Ps. 9/4, instead of בְּשׁוּב, read בְּשׁוּף, which presents the idea of cowardly attack from behind. In Isa. 2/20, for פְּרוֹת, which cannot be associated with other forms bearing a meaning suited to the context, read בְּרוֹת, so that the expression may become 'to dig pits' (for hiding in): cf. verses 10, 19 etc. Ps. 80/17 (for פְּנֵיךָ read בְּנֵיךָ). Ps. 83/17 פְּנֵיהֶם should be בְּנֵיהֶם ('their children', to distinguish between these and their fathers who are to perish).

Though ב and צ exhibit only a few points of resemblance, they have undoubtedly been confused in some ancient MSS. Evidence appears in Jer. 31/8, where יָבֹאוּ ('they shall come') is rendered in the Septuagint Version (in which the numbering is 38/9) by ἐξῆλθον, for which יָצְאוּ is the Hebrew equivalent; in Prov. 18/9, among other changes absolutely necessary in this seriously deformed verse, כְּבַרְיַח should be altered to כְּצַרְיַח that the clause in which it stands may give the sense, 'like the watch-tower, strong-tower of a palace'.

ב and ק confused; Mal. 3/16 for חֹשְׁבֵי read חֹשְׁקֵי (intense lovers of).

---

1) See page—16.

If the basal line of ב be wanting, ר is the resultant form, and this holds good in most Semitic alphabets (see the Tables); confusion between them is thus quite natural. In Ex. 23/5, there are no fewer than three forms of the verb עָזַב ('to leave') which should in every instance be the corresponding forms of עָזַר ('to help'). In Ps. 10/8, יֵשֵׁב ('he sitteth'), as indicated by the Note-line, is too mild a term to suit the context, and must be replaced by יָשֹׁר (for יָשׁוּר, 'he watcheth', or 'he lieth in wait' cf. Jer. 5/26; Num. 23/9 etc.); the same change must be made on the participle יֹשֵׁב ('sitting') in Ps. 17/12; in Hos. 13/12, צָרוּר ('bound up') should rather be צָבוּר ('stored up'), i. e. reserved for a day of judgment). The assurance, in the second half of Ps. 37/19, that the righteous 'shall be satisfied' in days of evil makes the declaration, in the first half, that 'they shall not be ashamed' (or 'disappointed'), in a time of evil, somewhat inappropriate; but by changing יִבֹּשׁוּ to יָרֻשׁוּ, a fitting parallel is obtained ('they shall not come to want'). Isa. 3/14 end for וְשָׁרָיו read וְשָׂבָיו ('and its aged').

Though the respective forms of ב and שׁ, or שׂ, in all the Semitic alphabets, have little in common, one has sometimes been mistaken for the other. In Isa. 3/2, נָבִיא ('prophet') must give place to נָשִׂיא ('prince'), which suits the context better; in Ps. 22/16, a more appropriate form than כַּחֶרֶשׁ ('like the potsherd'), to which the Note-line is appended, is בַּחֹרֶב ('with the dry heat'); in Job. 1/19, for בָּאָה ('came'), at which also the Note-line is placed, it may be best to substitute שְׂאָה ('a devastating storm'). Ps. 68/18 for רֶכֶב read רֶכֶשׁ ('properties, estates'). Ps. 31/21; and 80/18 for אִישׁ read אֹיֵב ('enemy').

The forms of ב and ת show little or no resemblance except in the Palmyrene characters and the Hebrew alphabet current about the Christian era; hence, confusion of these two letters is comparatively rare: some cases, however,

have occurred. In Ps. 29/7, the unsuitable form חֹצֵב ('heweth') must be a mistranscription of הַצִּית which, when substituted, makes the sentence fitly close with the expression 'kindleth flames of fire'. The perplexing form וְהָצֵב at the beginning of Nah. 2/8, should be וְהָצַת ('and set on fire') and be transferred to the end of the preceding verse. In Num. 4/18, the inappropriate command אַל תַּכְרִיתוּ ('do not cut off') ought to be אַל תַּקְרִיבוּ ('Do not bring near'). In Isa. 21/15, for חֶרְבוֹת ('swords') read חֲנִיתוֹת ('spears'), as mention of a sword is made in the next clause. In Isa. 1/7, אַתָּה should perhaps be the same word אִבָּה ('green produce').

(c) In the Samaritan alphabet, ג and ד show close resemblance, and are thus apt to be confused; occurrences, however, are not common. In Ps. 12/5, the expression לִלְשֹׁנֵנוּ נַגְבִּיר has been very properly marked as questionable by the old transcriber who prefixed the Note-line; but substitution of the resemblants בִּלְשֹׁנֵנוּ נְדַבֵּר ('with our own tongue we shall speak') brings these into line with the preceding and succeeding context. The former half of Ps. 109/10 ('Let his children be constant wanderers and beg'), may be accepted as presenting a reasonable and appropriate utterance; but there is ground for hesitation, in regarding the remainder of the verse וְדָרְשׁוּ מֵחָרְבוֹתֵיהֶם (R. V. 'and let them seek (their bread) out of their desolate places') as a fitting continuation; the Septuagint rendering of the verb-form (viz. ἐκβληθήτωσαν, 'let them be cast out'), however, may be taken as a guide in amending the Massoretic Text, and changing this to the more appropriate expression וְגֹרְשׁוּ מֵחֻבְרוֹתֵיהֶם ('and let them be driven from their companionships'), which falls into line with the former part. Curiously, in Ps. 85/9, the second יְדַבֵּר should be יַגְבִּיר ('shall confirm', 'secure constantly'). Ps. 78/34 הֱרָגָם should be חָרְדוּ ('they feared him.').

Between ג and ה there is certainly little resemblance

of form, in later Semitic alphabets, that might give much ground for believing in transcriptional interchange of these two letters, but considering even the possibility—not to say probability—of disappearance, in early forms of ה, of one or two lines from this letter, the remainder might readily be mistaken for ג: such a substitution, in Ps. 80/2, of the inappropriate participle נֹהֵג ('driving') for the resemblant נֹחֵה ('leading'), fitly used in describing a shepherd's guidance of his flock, at once becomes intelligible.

Between ג and ו, there is considerable but not close resemblance in some Semitic alphabets, particularly the Samaritan and the modern Hebrew; confusion accordingly appears to have taken place in a number of passages. In Deut. 26/3, doubt may be entertained regarding the correctness of the opening verb-form in the acknowledgment of the pious Israelite, 'I declare to-day to the Lord thy God that I am come to the land which the Lord swear unto our fathers to give to us'; but if the received form הִגַּדְתִּי be treated as a transcriptional error for the resemblant הוֹדֵתִי, and this be substituted, the statement becomes quite appropriate, 'I praise the Lord thy God to-day that---'. In the middle of Ruth 4/5, the unworkable Massoretic reading וּמֵאֵת רוּת ('and from Ruth') must originally have been גַּם אֶת־רוּת, the accusatival expression in the clause, 'Ruth also . . . hast thou bought . . . ' In Ps. 3/4, if the questionable form כְּבוֹדִי ('my glory') be changed to the resemblant כְּבִגְדִי, the first part of the verse presents a meaning more suited to the context, viz. 'But thou, O Lord, dost protect me closely round about, like my garment'. Though the first part of Ps. 9/19 ('The needy shall not always be forgotten') commends itself, there is good ground for hesitation in accepting the Massoretic reading in the latter part, ('the expectation of afflicted ones shall perish for ever'); many expositors try to evade the difficulty by questionably re-

peating 'not' (from the first part) in this second half, but a better course is to change עֲנִיִּים into the resemblant עֲנֻגִּים, and thus ensure for the closing portion a contrast between it and the preceding, thus, '(but) the expectation of luxurious livers shall perish for ever'. A more probable form than יֶהְגֶּה ('Meditates') in Ps. 37/20, is the resemblant יְחַוֶּה ('utters', or 'declares'), which completely harmonises with the parallel verb ('speaks') in the latter half of the verse: similar corrections are required in Job. 27/4; Ps. 35/28; Isa. 59/3 etc.

Between ג and ז, resemblance presents itself only in the modern Hebrew alphabet; exchange of one for the other, accordingly, has taken place in comparatively recent times. In Ezek. 47/13, the expression גֶּה גְּבוּל is a transcriptional error for זֶה גְּבוּל ('this (is the) border'), which correctly appears in verse 15; in Amos 5/24, the opening verb-form וְיִגַּל ('and let it roll') should rather be its resemblant וְיִזַּל ('and let it flow down'), inasmuch as נָזַל is the proper term to be used when mention is made of liquids (see Jer. 9/17, Isa. 45/8 etc.); in Joel 1/12, for גַּם ('also'), read זַיִת ('olive'), which certainly ought to be mentioned here with other familiar fruit-trees of Palestine; in Gen. 15/13, forming part of the divine announcement in a vision to Abram regarding the stay of his posterity in Egypt, it is stated, according to the Massoretic Text, that his seed should there be גֵּר ('sojourning'), but the Note-line placed beside this term evidently questions whether the genuine reading should not rather be זָר ('foreign').

ג and ה interchanged: see Ps. 80/2 (read נֹהֶה for נֹהֵג).

Only in the Palmyrene characters does the confusion between ג and י seem possible; a few cases, however, have obviously occurred. In Num. 21/32, by setting aside the Qeri וַיִּירֶשׁ in favour of its resemblant וַיְגָרֶשׁ, there is obtained the appropriate statement that the spies sent out by Moses to the town of Jazer took it 'and expelled the Amorites

who dwelt there'. Similarly, in Deut. 2/12, by changing the questionable form יִירָשׁוּם into the resemblant גָּרְשׁוּם we secure a smoother reading: the Horim formerly dwelt in Mount Seir, but the children of Esau 'drove them out'. In Amos 6/8, the Lord is represented in the Massoretic Text as stating that he would 'deliver over' the city of Samaria and all that it contained; but as no mention is made of the enemies to whom delivery was to be made, וְהִסְגַּרְתִּי may reasonably be set aside in favour of the more probable resemblant וַהֲסִירֹתִי ('and I will remove').

That ג and ל should be exchanged seems hardly probable on epigraphical grounds, yet some passages show this confusion. In I. Sam. 17/32, the expression אַל יִפֹּל לֵב should rather be אַל יָפֹג לֵב, inasmuch as the heart of one who is dismayed is not said to 'fall', but rather to 'faint'; in Prov. 13/21, instead of יְשַׁלֵּם ('shall recompense'), put יַשִּׂיגֵם ('shall overtake them'),—a verb which forms a fitting parallel to 'pursue' in the former half of the verse. In Cant. 8/2, the unsuitable term אֲנַהֲגֵךְ ('I would drive thee') must be a transcriptional error for the resemblant אֲנַהֲלֵךְ ('I would lead thee gently'). Ps. 64/7 instead of the questionable לֵב ('heart') read גֵּב 'a ditch', which suits the context better. Ps. 68/10 for גֶּשֶׁם 'rain' (which did not fall) read לֶחֶם 'b r e a d' (manna).

Similarly, in Ps. 78/52 וַיְנַהֲגֵם gives too strong a meaning, and should be וַיְנַהֲלֵם. Isa. 40/24 גִּזְעָם should be לְזַעַם ('he hath been enraged'). Ps. 68/18 for שְׁנָאָן read יַשְׂגִּיא ('exalts'). Ps. 68/11 for לְעָנִי read לַעֲנִי 'of God, for he is kind to the wicked' (cf. also end of v. 19).

Resemblance betweem ג and נ, obvious in most Semitic alphabets, sufficiently accounts for confusion of the two by transcribers. In I. Kings 4/13, the proper name גֶּבֶר is represented as Ναβέρ by the Septuagint translator; the

converse exchange has been made by Hebrew Scribes in Ps. 37/23, 40/5; Mich. 2/2, and other passages in which גֶּבֶר ('a strong man') is obviously an error for נָבָר ('pure', lit. 'an honest and upright man'); similarly the Septuagint rendering of לָנוּ ('for us') in Isa. 6/8, viz. πρὸς τὸν λαόν, shows that the term in the Hebrew text was taken to be לַגּוֹי ('to the people'). In Gen. 37/2, instead of נַעַר referring to Joseph as a 'youth', it is certainly right to restore גָּעַר, and thus obtain the appropriate statement that 'he had reproved' the sons of Zilpah for their sinful conduct; similarly, in Ps. 88/16, parallelism shows that מִנֹּעַר ('from youth') should be מִגַּעֲרַ ('because of the reprovre').

Between ג and ס rarely any resemblance of form can be perceived in the Semitic alphabets, yet substitution of one letter for the other seems to have taken place in Ps. 76/11 where תַּחְגֹּר is unsuitable and should be set aside in favour of תֵּחָסֵר ('shall be diminished').

In some of the ancient alphabets, ג and פ exhibit some points of resemblance which might lead a transcriber to mistake one for the other. Such exchange has evidently taken place in I. Kings 11/24, where בַּהֲרֹג ('in slaying') is quite unsuited to the context, and must be changed to בַּהֲדֹף ('in expelling'); similarly, in Ex. 23/7, תַּהֲרֹג is too strong a term, and must be regarded a transcriptional error for תְּהֲדֹף ('repel'), or, more probably תְּחָרֵף ('scorn'). Further, in Zach. 2/10, for פֵּרַשְׂתִּי ('I have spread out') a more suitable reading is גֵּרַשְׂתִּי ('I have driven out').

In some of the Semitic alphabets, especially the earlier, ג and ר present features of resemblance which might naturally lead to a confusion of the two letters. For סָר ('hath departed') in Ps. 14/3, the resemblant form סָג, of similar sense, appears in the parallel, Ps. 53/4; in Isa. 47/3, instead of אֶפְגַּע ('I will meet'), a more probable reading is אֶפְרַע ('I will let go'); in Jer. 6/28, for סָרֵי read סִיג ('mixed metal'),

which suits the context better; in Hab. 1/4, for תָּפוּג ('is torpid') read תּוּפַר ('is made void'). In Ps. 63/8 instead of אֲרַנֵּן ('I shall shout') a more appropriate form is the Poal אֲגֹנַן ('I shall be covered—'), as the Psalmist speaks of being under the shadow of the divine wings.

Though ג and ש exhibit no resemblance in any of the Semitic alphabets, substitution of one for the other seems to have taken place in Exod. 15/7, where—as shown by the context, which deals with the overthrow of the Egyptians in the Red Sea—(besides mistaken substitution of תַּהֲרֹס for גְּאוֹנְךָ· תַּחֲרִים, ought rather to be שְׁאוֹנְךָ where full correction is made), the resultant meaning appropriately becomes, 'through the greatness of thy sweeping devastation, thou dost utterly destroy those who rise up against thee (see Jer. 25/31). Conversely, in Isa. 5/14 וּשְׁאוֹנָהּ should be וְגֵאוֹנָם ('and their pride'. So in v. 29, שְׁאָגָה should more fitly be גְּאָוָה pride.

(d) Examination of the various Semitic alphabets shows that ד and ה bear little resemblance to each other in the earlier, while the modern Hebrew characters are apt to be confused. Critics generally agree that in Isa. 63/1, צֹעֶה ('bending') should rather be צֹעֵד ('marching'); in Prov. 14/23, for יְהִיֶה read יָדִים ('hands'), inasmuch as there is a contrast between the results of labour and mere talk; in Jer. 14/9, the unique form נִדְהָם (generally held to signify 'dazed' or 'stupid') was obviously taken to be נִרְדָּם ('soundly sleeping') by the Septuagint translator, whose rendering is ὑπνῶν; in Ps. 49/14, בְּפִיהֶם ('in their mouth'), which is rightly queried through the prefixed Note-line, should rather be בְּפִידָם ('in their calamity' lit. in their death).

Resemblance between ד and ו, slight in some alphabets, and not at all apparent in others, has given rise to some confusion between the letters. See I. Kings 12/33, where the Kethib מִלְבַד is noted in the Qeri as a transcript-

ional error for מִלִּבּוֹ ('from his heart'); in I. Sam. 21/14, LXX 21—12 בְּיָדָם ('in their hand') is represented in the Septuagint by ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, i. e. בְּיוֹם ('in the day'); but in Isa. 10/5, the converse change is required for obtaining the appropriate thought 'in the day of mine indignation' (cf. Zeph. 1/15, 18; Ezek. 22/24; Prov. 11/4; in I/Kings 11/24), the Massoretic reading וַיֵּלְכוּ ('and they went') is too mild a term to suit the context, and must be replaced by the more appropiate וַיִּלְכֹּד ('and he captured'), as indicated by the Septuagint,[1] προκατελάβετο.

A natural mistranscription in Ps. 66/7 is בַּגּוֹיִם ('among the nations') instead of בֹּגְדִים ('deceivers', or 'cheats'), as in Hab. 1/5 (cf. verse 13). In Ps. 102/8, for שָׁקַדְתִּי ('I watch'), read שַׁקֹּתִי ('I run to and fro').

Between ד and ח, in the older Semitic alphabets, there is little resemblance; but, in the more modern Hebrew characters, if the upright line at the left side of ח becomes obscured, ד results; hence it is only during later times that mistranscriptions can have occurred, in the case of these two letters. Instances appear in Prov. 4/3, where, for וְיָחִיד ('and only'), it is better to read וְיָדִיד, which is represented by the Septuagint, καὶ ἀγαπώμένος ('and beloved'); in Prov. 28/25, where the unsuitable conclusion יְדֻשָּׁן ('he shall be made fat') should rather be יַחְשֹׁךְ ('he shall quiet it'), which forms a more fitting antithesis to the first clause. In Isa. 8/10, where the context treats largely of leagues between nations, דַּבְּרוּ דָבָר ('speak a word'), the correct reading should rather be חִבְּרוּ חֶבֶר ('form a confederacy').

Confusion between ד and י might easily arise in transcribing the later Hebrew characters, which show some similarity, but could hardly have taken place in the case of the other alphabets. Instances of misapprehension appear

---

[1] Verse 14 in the Version.

in Amos 9/12, where the expression לְמַעַן יִירְשׁוּ ('in order that they may possess') appears in the Septuagint[1] as ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν לְמַעַן יִדְרְשׁוּ ('in order that they may seek'); in Hos. 6/8, where מִדָּם ('by blood') is represented in the old Greek Translation by ὕδωρ מַיִם ('water'); in Ps. 20/6, when the perplexing form נִדְגֹּל should be נָגִיל ('we shall rejoice'); in 22/27, where יְחִי should be יַחֵד, so as to give the meaning required by the context ('let your heart be glad'), a similar change in Ps. 69/33; in Gen. 16/12 and Job. 11/12 where פֶּרֶא אָדָם (generally rendered 'a wild ass of a man') should rather be פֶּרֶא אָיִם ('a fierce wild ass'); in Isa. 8/23, the noun דֶּרֶךְ presents a meaning ('way') which cannot be readily accepted as suited to the context, and may thus be set aside in favour of the resemblant יֶרֶךְ so as to make the clause more definitely signify 'the side of the sea'. Ps. 31/20 for בְּנֵי אָדָם and פְּנֵי אָיִם.

As ד and כ in the Egyptian Aramaic script and the Palmyrene inscriptions bear a close resemblance, these two letters might sometimes be mistaken, one for the other. For instances of confusion, see I. Sam. 4/13, where the Massoretic יָד is corrected in the Qeri to יַד; Job. 29/4, where Perles rightly corrects בְּסוֹד ('in the secret') into בְּסֹךְ ('in protecting'); Prov. 25/27, where כְּבוֹדָם ('their honour') is represented in the Septuagint by λόγους דְּבָרִים ('words').

In the case of ד and ל, resemblance at certain points in their respective forms, particularly in the Palmyrene characters, might well lead to misapprehension by a transcriber; instances of confusion are somewhat frequent. In Ps. 118/27, Isa. 47/7, and other passages, for עַד ('till') read עַל ('upon', etc.); conversely, for עַל, the Septuagint translator has read עַד (ἕως) in Jud. 4/11; Mic. 1/14; I/Kings 15/20 etc. in Ps. 75/10, אַגִּיד ('I shall declare') should rather be אָגִיל ('I shall

[1] Quoted in Acts 15/17.

rejoice'), as indicated by the Septuagint ἀγαλλιάσομαι (Ps. 74/10 in this Version); in Isa. 47/6, for חִלַּלְתִּי ('I profaned') read חָדַלְתִּי ('I forsook'). In Isa. 1/27, the context shows that exception must be taken to the Massoretic form תִּפָּדֶה, which makes the clause mean 'Zion shall be redeemed with Justice'; the genuine reading is either תִּפָּלֵה ('shall be distinguished' through the pronouncing just sentences) or, תִּפְרֶה ('shall flourish'); in 8/19, בְּעַד should be בַּעַל which, with the succeeding genitive, gives the meaning 'the lord of life', as required by the context.

That ד and מ so resemble each other that one might be mistaken for the other is, in most of the early Semitic alphabets, by no means apparent: in the Palmyrene characters, however, they are somewhat similar at the top: that they have been confused is nevertheless evident from some actual instances. In Zach. 6/14 appears the name חֵלֶם, borne by one who had returned to Jerusalem from the Captivity in Babylon; but the same person, obviously, is mentioned as חֶלְדַּי in verse 10; in Jud. 6/15 כִּדְי אַרְבֶּה must surely be an error for כְּמוֹ אַרְבֶּה ('like locusts'). In Ps. 57/3, considerable ingenuity is required to justify retention of the received participial form גֹּמֵר, to which a special meaning ('accomplishing') has been assigned; a further difficulty is its construction with the preposition following; a satisfactory solution, however, is obtained by merely substituting the resemblant גֹּדֵר, which signifies here that the Lord 'surrounds' the Psalmist as with a protecting fence or wall.

That ד and נ should be sometimes confused is not easy to explain from comparison of their respective forms in different alphabets, yet such misapprehension by transcribers has sometimes taken place. Thus, in II. Kings 15/29, קֶדֶשׁ, the name of a town in Northern Palestine, appears in the Greek Version as Κενες (i.e. קֶנֶשׁ); in Jud. 17/3, לְבְנִי ('to my son') is represented in the same Version (Cod.

A., and Lucian), by κατὰ μόνας לְבַד ('apart'); in Ps. 89/9 instead of the perplexing expression חֲסִין יָהּ, some such form as חַסְדְּךָ ('thy kindness'), inasmuch as the noun חֶסֶד is often joined with אֱמוּנָה, as here; in Prov. 5/9, for הוֹדְךָ ('thine honour'), it is better to substitute the more appropriate form הוֹנְךָ ('thy wealth'), as Grätz suggests; in Amos 3/15, for בָּתֵּי הַשֵּׁן ('the houses of ivory') read בָּתֵּי הַשֹּׁד ('the houses of plunder'). Ps. 61/8, the perplexing form מַן is probably a fragment for תָּמִיד (continually, the ת having been omitted after אֱמֶת). In Ps. 39/12 חֲמוּדוֹ perhaps ought rather to be חֲמוֹנוֹ ('his wealth').

In the Palmyrene alphabet, but in no other, there is some resemblance between ד and ס; hence, the cases in which confusion has occurred are few. Instances, however, appear in Ps. 31/12, where מְאֹד (rightly queried through insertion of the Note-line) should be מָאֹס ('an aversion', as in Lam. 3/45; see also Ps. 78/59); in Amos 4/10, where שְׁבִי סוּסֵיכֶם should be שֵׂבֵי סוֹדֵיכֶם ('The hoary bearded men of your councils'). [1]

The Palmyrene and —though in less degree— the Egyptian Aramaic characters show such a resemblance between ד and ע that transcribers might mistake one for the other. Instances of confusion appear in I. Sam. 14/9, where the expression עַד הַגִּיעֵנוּ ('until we come') is rendered in the Septuagint ἕως ἂν ἀπαγγείλωμεν, and must have been read as עַד הַגִּידֵנוּ ('until we tell'); in Job 28/13, where עֶרְכָּהּ ('its value') as shown by the Septuagint ὁδὸν αὐτῆς, should rather be דַּרְכָּהּ ('Its way', i. e. the way of it); in Jud. 10/12, where וּמָעוֹן ('and Maon'), as indicated by Grätz, should be וּמִדְיָן ('and Midian'); in Ps. 17/1, where צֶדֶק ('righteousness'),

---

[1] It is to be observed, however, that these instances of confusion between ד and ס may be due to the affinity of s o u n d between dentals and sibilants : see foot-note on page.

marked by the Note-line as a difficulty, is proved by the parallelism to be a transcriptional error for צַעֲקָתִי ('my outcry'). Ps. 80/17 מְגַעֲרַת, should be מְגֻדֶרָה ('fence wall'). Ps. 32/9, for כְּפֶרֶד, read כְּסוּס נִפְרָע refractory horse. Ps. 68/20 יַעֲמָס ('loadeth') should rather be יַעֲמֹד 'takes a stand' (for us).

Between ד and ק, in the modern Hebrew characters as well as in the Egyptian Aramaic, considerable similarity would arise through the absence of the upright line forming part of the latter. Instances of actual confusion between the two letters occur in Jer. 31/18, where, for the Massoretic form סָפַקְתִּי ('I smote'), the Septuagint rendering (38/19) ἐστέναξα points to סָפַדְתִּי ('I wailed').

ד and ם confused in Joel 2/8, where וּבְעַד should rather be וּמְעוֹף so that this, with the preceding word, may become in sense ('and as (with)' the flight of a missile).

The resemblance between ד and ר is so close, not merely in the Modern Hebrew, but also in nearly all early Semitic characters—Samaritan, Phoenician, Palmyrene, Egyptian-Aramaic, as well as those in the Mesa Stone and the Siloam inscription—that instances of confusion between these two letters are exceptionally numerous; only a few examples need be given. Even the Massoretes grant that אֶאֱבַד in Jer.2/20 should be אֶאֱבַר. The personal name הַדַּדְעֶזֶר, occurring in the Massoretic Text of II. Sam. 8/3, appears in some Hebrew MSS. as הַדַּרְעֶזֶר; in I. Kings 11/14,17, (twice), 19,21, the name of a member of the royal family in Edom is given as הֲדַד, but in the Septuagint, Ἀδερ is the corresponding form throughout. In Hos. 10/14, כְּשֹׁד ('like destruction') is rendered ὡς ἄρχων by the Septuagint translator, who obviously read it as כְּשַׂר ('like a prince'); similarly, in Isa. 16/4, שֹׁד is represented by ἄρχων. In Isa. 27/2, חֶמֶר ('wine') should rather be חֶמֶד ('delight', or 'pleasure'); in Ps. 54/5 occurs the form זָרִים ('strangers'), whereas, in the parallel verse, Ps. 86/14, the reading is זֵדִים ('proud ones'); con-

versely, in Mal. 3/15, for the latter Hebrew term, the Septuagint translator, by writing ἀλλοτρίους, shows that he read the former; in verse 19, he took the same view, though at this point, ἀλλογενεῖς appears as his rendering (see also Isa. 25/2): in Mic. 7/12, the Massoretic form עָדֶיךָ ('unto thee'), is represented in the Septuagint by αἱ πόλεις σου, showing that the translator read it as עָרֶיךָ ('thy cities'). In I. Sam. 10/24, וַיָּרִיעוּ ('and they shouted') has been misread by the Greek translator as וַיֵּדְעוּ, his rendering being καὶ ἔγνωσαν ('and they knew'); in Prov. 15/23, as indicated by Perles, מוּסַר ('admonition') should rather be מוּסַד ('foundation'); in Prov. 22/12. for דַּעַת ('knowledge'), רָעוֹת ('evils') is a fitting correction; in Amos 8/8, כָּאֹר should be כְּאֵד ('like a mist'). Noteworthy is the confusion sometimes appearing between אֲרָם ('Aramaic', or 'Syriac'), with its derivative אֲרַמִּי for ('Aramean') and אֱדֹם ('Edom') with its Gentilic noun אֲדֹמִי ('Edomite'): thus, in Amos, instead of 'to Edom', there must be substituted 'to Syria'; conversely, in II. Sam. 8/13, that 'Syria' is a transcriptional error for 'Edom' is evident from the next verse, which tells of David's placing garrisons in the latter land, and from a consideration of II. Kings 14/7, which records another defeat of the Edomites in the same 'Valley of salt'; in I. Sam. 21/7 and 22/9, the person called 'Doeg the Edomite' in the Massoretic text is called Δωὴκ ὁ Σύρος in the Septuagint Version. Obviously also, אֶחָד ('one') and אַחֵר ('another') are apt to be confused: see the difference between the received Hebrew text and the Greek version in I. Sam. 14/40; II. Sam. 7/23; Jer. 32/39; Amos 7/1 etc. Isa. 1/27, for תִּפָּדֶה read תִּפְרֶה ('shall flourish') or תִּפָּלֶה ('shall be distinguished'). Isa. 5/17 for גְּרִים read גְּדָיִם ('kids').

Little resemblance can be traced between ד and ש, yet there are a few cases in which these two letters seem to have been confused. Such are Ps. 31/8, where יָדַעְתָּ ('thou hast known') is represented in the Septuagint (see also the

Vulgate and the Ethiopic) by ἔσωσας, הוֹשַׁעְתָּ ('thou didst (save'); Nah. 1/7, where וְיוֹדֵעַ ('and knoweth') is surely too mild a term to suit the context, but should rather be יוֹשִׁיעַ 'he saveth'). In Ps. 72/14, the Septuagint translators, by their rendering of דָּמָם ('their blood') as τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν, show that they read it as שְׁמָם ('their name').

(e) In a few of the older Semitic alphabets, ה and ו show some points of resemblance which might easily cause confusion. The similarity is perhaps most apparent in the Samaritan, but even in the modern Hebrew characters, attrition of ה at the left side makes the residuum look like ו. It is accordingly not surprising to find, in Jer. 37/19, the Kethib וְאַיּוֹ but וְאַיֵּה ('and where?') as the Qeri; in Jer. 3/24, the Kethib נַפְשׁוֹ is corrected in the margin as נַפְשָׁהּ; in Prov. 17/22, the unique and questionable form גָּהָה should be replaced by גִּוָּה or גִּוִּיָּה ('body'). Gen. 1/24 חַיַּתוֹ אֶרֶץ should rather be חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ as in v. 25.

The obvious likeness between ה and ח in the m o d e r n forms of the Hebrew alphabet—for similarity between them does not obtain in their earlier forms—has already been noted in treating of their similarity in sound (see page 17). Some additional instances may here be given, without venturing to decide whether the confusion is due to similarity in sound or similarity in form; on the latter alternative, the exchange must of course have taken place in later times. In Ps. 101/5 and Prov. 28/25, the construct adjectival form רְחַב ('broad') does not suit the context, but the resemblant רְהַב ('harsh', or 'arrogant') is appropriate. Similarly, in Prov. 21/4, the same form הִרְחַב must be set aside in favour of the noun רֹהַב ('insolence'). Instead of the unworkable form לְחֻלְכָה in Ps. 10/8, read לַהֲלִיכָה ('for a company of travellers'). In Ps, 107/5, בָּהֶם ('within them') should rather be בָּחֹם ('through heat'). In Hab. 2/13, instead of the awkward and inappropriate הֵגָּה ('behold') there must be restored the

resemblant and fitting חֵמָה ('wrath'); in Ex. 32/12, for the inappropriate בֶּהָרִים ('in the mountains'), substitute בַּחֵרֶם ('with utter destruction'). In Prov. 27/6, the tameness of the verse disappears by changing the opening term גְּלָה to the Piel imperative גַּלַּח, when the meaning of the first clause becomes, 'Cut strong grass closely, and tender grass will appear'; in Ps. 71/6, which is pervaded by the spirit of trust in the Lord, by changing תְּהִלָּתִי ('my psalm') into תּוֹחַלְתִּי, as Wellhausen correctly observes, the last clause gives the appropriate meaning, 'in thee is my hope continually'. In Isa. 42/10, תְּהִלָּתוֹ ('his praise') has been misread by the Septuagint translator, whose rendering, ἡ ἀσχὴ αὐτοῦ, represents תְּחִלָּתוֹ ('his beginning'). In Prov. 5/11, the opening form וְנָהַמְתָּ ('and thou shalt moan') should probably be וְנִחַמְתָּ ('and thou shalt repent'); in II. Sam. 1/18, for חָלָל ('slain') read הֵילֵל ('wail'); and in Ps. 56/7, for the pronoun הֵמָּה, substitute חֵמָה, so that the clause may bear the appropriate meaning 'they store up wrath'. Ps. 78/63, for הוֹלָלוּ read חוֹלָלוּ, and thus obtain the meaning 'did not d a n c e'.

ה and כ seem to be interchanged.

Ps. 28/1, for תֶּחֱשֶׁה, put תֶּחֱשַׁךְ ('but then become dark').

Though it is difficult to perceive resemblance between ה and ל either in the modern Hebrew or in the earlier Semitic alphabets, there are certainly instances in which these two letters have been confused by transcribers. Thus, in Hos. 10/2, הוּא in the middle of the verse, is obviously an error for לוּא ('if'), as proved by the conclative כִּי עַתָּה at the beginning of the next verse, introducing the apodosis of a purely hypothetical sentence. In Ex. 15/1, 21, the expression גָּאֹה גָּאָה ('he hath acted most proudly') is there questionably used of God; and the correct reading should rather be גָּאֹל גָּאַל ('he hath completely redeemed') a thought eminently suitable in describing the deliverance of the Israelites from Pharaoh. In Hab. 2/16, הֵעָרֵל ('show thyself to be uncircum-

cised') is a far less probable reading than הֵעָרֵה ('uncover thyself').

Numerous are the instances in which ה and מ (or ם), have been confused; examination of the forms, however, in which the two letters appear in the alphabets used at different periods proves that most of the changes have taken place in comparatively later times, when the modern Hebrew characters had come into use. In Gen. 18/20, (where the Note-line has been inserted), for כָּלָה ('wholly') read כֻּלָּם ('all of them'), as Bort suggests; in Ps. 59/2, for הִנֵּה ('behold'), read חִנָּם ('without cause'); in Zach. 6/10, a better reading than אַתָּה ('thou') is אִתָּם ('with them'); in I. Kings, 14/31 and other passages, the name of the son and successor of Rehoboam is given as אֲבִיָּם, whereas אֲבִיָּה is the form appearing in the parallels II. Chr. 12/16 etc.; in Num. 19/3, the plural verb-form וּנְתַתֶּם ('and ye shall give') is somewhat surprising, and ought rather to be וְנָתַתָּ, in accordance with the singulars in the preceding verse; similarly, in I. Sam. 9/21, instead of the plural form וַאֲכַלְתֶּם ('and ye shall eat'), the context requires the singular וְאָכַלְתָּ ('and thou shalt eat'). In Josh. 10/28, אוֹתָם ('them') is properly marked as an error by the Massoretes, who give אוֹתָהּ ('it, viz, the city') as the correct form; similarly, in Hos. 9/2, בָּהּ in the received text is to be set aside in favour of בָּם, which is attested by the Septuagint and many MSS., and supported by several editors; conversely, in Jud. 2/22, בָּם is a manifest transcriptional error for a בָּהּ ('in it'), inasmuch as the reference is to walking in a 'way'; in Gen. 20/12, for אָמְנָה, it is better to read אָמְנָם ('truly'). Ps. 76/3 בְּשָׁלֵם should be בִּשְׁלֵה (cf. Josh. 18/11). In Ps. 68/5, the noun suffix at the end of תַּנְחֵם is superfluous, the form should simply be תַּנְחֵהּ ('thou shalt lead'). Isa. 7/16 (end) for מִלְכֶיהָ put מְלָכִים ('Kings', Rezin and Pekah) for Judah had only one king.

The forms of ה and נ (or ן) bear little resemblance

to each other in any of the early Semitic alphabets; nevertheless, some instances of confusion occur. Substitution appears in Hos. 2/14, where the unique form אָתְנָה should be אֶתְנַן ('hire' of an harlot), as suggested by Wellhausen; in Zeph. 1/9, instead of הַמִּפְתָּן ('the threshold') read הַמְפַתֶּה ('the deceiver'); in Hab. 1/4, instead of עַל כֵּן ('therefore'), it is better to read עַל מֶה ('wherefore?'), and thus bring the whole verse into line with the preceding; in Ps. 3/3, change of אֵין ('there is not') into אַיֵּה ('where?') makes the whole clause more vivid. Conversely, in Amos. 3/6 (end), for עָשָׁה read עָשָׁן ('smoke') (of God in his displeasure: cf. Ps. 80/5); and in Ps. 119/117, for וְאֶשְׁעֶה read וְאֶשָּׁעֵן ('and let me lean') (cf. Isa. 50/10). Isa. 40/end of v. 9. and beg. of v. 10, הִנֵּה ('behold') occurs; probably assimilation has taken place. For the f i r s t, read חַנּוּן ('merciful is your God').

Little resemblance obtains between ה and פ (or ף) in the earlier alphabets; nevertheless, some cases of exchange appear. In Job. 4/18, the unique and puzzling form תָּהֳלָה is doubtless a transcriptional error for תִּפְלָה ('folly'; cf. Job. 24/12); Num. 33/4, the form וּבֵאלֹהֵיהֶם ('and on their gods') does not suit the context and should be וּבְאַלְפֵיהֶם ('and on their chiefs'; see Gen. 36/15 etc.) a similar change should be made in Ex. 12/12; 21/6; 22/27. Ps. 74/13 for פּוֹרַרְתָּ read הוֹרַדְתָּ (for יָם read רָם) to give the sense 'thou h a s t brought d o w n one who was high'.

Between ה and צ only a slight resemblance can be discerned and this in the Samaritan characters. Substitution of צֻרִים ('rocks') for הָרִים ('mountains') has probably taken place in Num. 23/9, where the succeeding context mentions 'hills'.

In the modern Hebrew alphabets, if the upright line on the left side of ה becomes dim or disappears, the remainder shows considerable resemblance to ר, for which accordingly, it may readily be mistaken; conversely, if an

upright line be accidently marked at the left side of ר, something like ה results. In I. Kings 22/49, the Massoretes note that the form עָשֶׂר is to be read as עָשָׂה ('he made'), conversely, in Prov. 23/5, the infinitive verb-form עָשֹׂה should be עֹשֶׁר ('riches'), and similarly, in Gen. 30/30, אֶעֱשֶׂה ('I shall do') should be אַעֲשִׁיר ('I shall grow rich'); in Jud. 7/3, instead of the impracticable form וְיִצְפֹּר, read וְיִצְפֶּה ('and let him keep watch'); in Ps. 52/9, for הַגֶּבֶר read גָּבֹהַּ ('a haughty man'). In Isa. 5/19; for וְתָבוֹאָה read וּתְבֹאַר ('and let it (the counsel of God) be explained').

In Zach. 11/16, הַנַּעַר is quite unsuitable, for this is masculine, while the associated forms are feminine; Grätz proposed to read הַנַּעֲה, but it is best, and indeed only right, to substitute הַנָּעָה (fem. partic. of נוּעַ), 'the wanderers'. In Lev. 5/22 (6/3 in English), for יַעֲשֶׂה, read יַעֲשִׁיר ('becometh rich'). In Prov. 16/30, for עֹצֶה, read עֹצֵר (not עֹצֵם, as Grätz suggests) in order to secure an appropriate combination ('he who shutteth his eyes'). In Isa. 6/11, (following the Septuagint, γῆ καταλειφθήσεται ἔρημος, and the Vulgate), the verb-form תִּשָּׁאֵה should be replaced by תִּשָּׁאֵר, so as to make good sense ('the land shall be left desolate'). In Jer. 10/19, for אַךְ זֶה restore אַכְזָר ('cruel'). In Ps. 75/9, for וְיַיִן חָמַר read וְיֵין חֵמָה ('and wine of wrath'): see Jer. 25/15; Isa. 51/17 (Rev. 16/19); Job. 21/20. In Hos. 7/6, for אֹפֵהֶם read אֲפִרִים (Sept. Αφραὶμ).

Confusion has arisen between ה and ש, but through similarity of sound (see p. 18), not form. Isa. 40/20 for מֵרֹאשׁ read מֵרֹאֵה.

Between ה and ת, resemblance appears only in the later Hebrew characters; even within these limits, however, confusion is somewhat common. In I. Sam. 10/27, for מִנְחָה ('a present'), the Septuagint δῶρα shows that the translator read the plural מִנְחֹת ('presents'); in Deut. 5/18 and 8/1, for the singular הַמִּצְוָה, read the plural הַמִּצְוֹת ('the command-

ments'); in Amos 8/10, for the singular לְקִינָה read the plural לְקִינוֹת ('to dirges'); in Jer. 10/7, for מַלְכוּתָם ('their royalty'), read מַלְכֵיהֶם ('their Kings'), as Grätz suggests; in Isa. 16/12 instead of the singular noun הַבָּמָה, the Septuagint rendering, Βωμοί, points to the plural הַבָּמוֹת ('the high places'); in Lam. 3/59, the Greek translator, by writing ἔκρινας as the equivalent of שָׁפְטָה ('judge thou') shows that he read this form as שָׁפַטְתָּ ('thou hast judged'); in Ps. 49/14, instead of אַחֲרֵיהֶם ('after them'), read אֵחֲרִיתָם ('their posterity') as Wellhausen proposes; in Isa. 9/3, for the construct form מַטֵּה ('rod'), read the construct מֹטֵת ('yoke-bar'). In Ps. 90/10, בָּהֶם (marked by the Note-line) must surely be a mistranscription of בְּתָם ('in (the case of) sound-constitutioned man').

(f) Only in the more modern Hebrew characters are ו and ז so resemblant as to induce confusion; the cases, moreover, are comparatively few. In Ezek. 47/17, the first word in the last clause (viz. וְאֵת פְּאַת הַצָּפוֹן) is unworkable, and should be זֹאת ('this'), as seen at the end of verse 20; a similar correction is also required at the close of verses 18 and 19. In Prov. 30/9, מִי יְהוָה ('Who is the Lord?') is represented in the Septuagint (30/9) by τίς με ἀρᾶ which may be regarded as representing מִי יֶחֱזֶה ('Who shall see?').

Confusion of ו with י is very common. The exchange of one for the other, however, can hardly have taken place in very early times, inasmuch as the alphabets then in use exhibit little similarity in the forms of these two letters; but that substitutions had already accurred some centuries before the Christian era is shown by many cases in which the Septuagint Version differs from the Hebrew Text[1] Only

---

[1] Many instances of these variations are cited by Driver in the Introduction to his Notes on the Books of Samuel page XV.

a few illustrations need be given now. In Gen. 36/15, one of the proper names, in its rarely consonantal text, appears in some MSS. as תּוֹמֶן, but the correct form is given as תֵּימָן in the Massoretic text; in Gen. 25/23, the consonants of the term for 'nations' have come in course of time to be wrongly written as גיים, which is corrected into גּוֹיִם by the Massoretes; in Jud. 6/5, the consonants in the term יבאו may be read as יָבֹאוּ ('and they will come'), but the view taken by the editors is that the form should rather be וּבָאוּ ('and they used to come'); in Jer. 48/7, כְּמוֹשׁ, the name of the national deity of the Moabites appears as כמיש in the Kethib; see also Mic. 1/8. An excellent illustration is presented in I. Sam. 12/3 where the Massoretic Text shows עֵינַי בּוֹ ('mine eyes with it'), whereas the Septuagint reading is ἀποκρίθητέ μοι, which represents עֲנוּ בִי ('make answer against me'); (cf. II. Sam. 1/16 etc.). In Hos. 13/2, where the expression זֹבְחֵי אָדָם ('sacrificers of men') appears, the form in the Septuagint corresponding to the construct participle is the imperative θύσατε, which represents זִבְחוּ ('sacrifice ye'); similarly, in Ps. 58/4, the expression דֹּבְרֵי כָזָב ('utterers of falsehood') is represented in the Greek translation (57/4) by ἐλάλησαν φευδῆ, i. e. דִּבְּרוּ כָזָב ('they have spoken lies'); in Zach. 5/6, עֵינָם ('their eye') was taken to be עֲוֹנָם ('their iniquity') by the Greek translator (whose rendering is ἡ ἀδικία αὐτῶν);[1] in Ps. 4/4, following Dyserrick, Grätz, Cheyne, and others, a more probable reading than חָסִיד לוֹ is חַסְדּוֹ לִי ('his kindness to me'). In Ps. 59/10 עֻזּוֹ is doubtless wrong, and should give place to עֻזִּי ('my strength') as found in verse 18; specially noteworthy in Hos. 12/6, where יְהוָה is represented in the Septuagint by ἔσται,

---

[1] Other instances of confusion between 'eye' and 'iniquity' become apparent in Ps. 73/7 and Hos. 10/10, where the Greek Version must be consulted.

i. e. יִהְיֶה ('will be'); in Prov. 13/20, the Massoretes fitly note that וְחָכָם should be יֶחְכָּם.

Though ו and כ show little mutual resemblance, except in the Egyptian-Aramaic characters, considerable confusion has arisen in transcribing these characters. See Jud. 5/31, where וְאֹהֲבָיו must rather be וְאֹהֲבֶיךָ ('but those who love thee'), to harmonise with the preceding portion of the verse, in which 'thine enemies' occurs; for the same reason, in Ps. 22/26, יְרֵאָיו should be changed to יְרֵיאֶיךָ ('those who fear thee'). Conversely, in Ps. 22/28, לְפָנֶיךָ (as indicated by the Septuagint ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ) should be לְפָנָיו ('before him'), in order to harmonise with the preceding context; in Ps. 90/12 (89/12 in the Septuagint) יָמֵינוּ ('our days') is represented in the Greek Version by τὴν δεξιάν σου, showing that the Translator read the form before him as יְמִינְךָ ('thy right hand'). An important and instructive instance of a notable change in transcription becomes evident when II. Kings 20/12 is compared with its parallel, Isa. 39/1; in the former passage, כִּי שָׁמַע ('for he had heard') appears in the latter as וַיִּשְׁמַע ('and he heard'); one may thus feel confident in venturing to change וַיִּשְׁכַּח in Hos. 8/14, into כִּי שָׁכַח ('for he hath forgotten'); similarly in II. Sam. 14/5, וַיָּמָת should be כִּי מֵת ('for he is dead'); in Mic. 3/4, וְיַסְתֵּר should rather be כִּי יַסְתִּיר ('for he will hide'); in Ps. 52/9, it is advisable to change וַיִּבְטַח into כִּי בָטַח ('for he trusted'); In Gen. 41/56, וַיֶּחֱזַק should be כִּי חָזָק; in Gen. 30/27, וַיְבָרְכֵנִי should be כִּי בֵרַכַנִי ('for he hath blessed me'); similary in Gen. 30/30, וַיְבָרֶךְ should be כִּי בֵרַךְ ('for he hath blessed').

As ו and ל could be mistaken, one for the other—and then merely in some alphabets—only when the latter was mis-shapen, or indistinctly formed, cases of exchange are comparatively few. In Isa. 37/26, גַּלִּים ('stone-heaps') is represented in the Septuagint by ἔθνη, גּוֹיִם ('nations'); in Ps. 19/5, קַוָּם ('their line') is inappropriate, but the Greek

ὁ φθόγγος ἀν αὐτῶν, viz. קוֹלָם ('their voice') represents a preferable reading; in Isa. 18/2 and 7, instead of the questionable expression[1] גּוֹי קָו קָו read גּוֹי נִקְלָקָל ('a contemptible (or 'despised') nation'); in Num. 24/8, for וְחִצָּיו ('and his arrows') read לְחֹצָיו ('those who oppress him'); conversely in Lev. 11/42 (middle of the verse), for לְכָל read וְכָל ('and all'). Ps. 78/4 הַתְּוּ is better read as הֻתְּלוּ (divided).

Resemblance between ו and מ (or ם) is anything but evident in the modern Hebrew alphabet; but the Pheonician, together with the Egyptian-Aramaic characters, display common features calculated to cause confusion. Examples appear in II. Sam. 12/15 compared with its parallel in Ps. 18/5, חִצִּים being found in the former passage, while the suffixed form חִצָּיו ('his arrows') occurs in the latter; in Nah. 3/19, where שִׁמְעֲךָ ('the report concerning thee') should rather be שַׁוְעֲךָ ('thy cry'). An objectionable reading, somewhat frequent, is אוֹ ('or') instead of אִם ('if'), seen in Ex. 21/36; Lev. 19/20; Num. 35/18; Eccl. 2/19, and elsewhere. Too frequently, the true sense of a passage is obscured by the substitution of עָמָל ('toil') for עָוֶל ('wrong-doing'), or ('injustice'), as in Isa. 10/1; 59/4; Job. 4/8; 15/35; Ps. 7/15; 17; 10/7, 14; 55/10; 94/20; 140/9; Prov. 24/2 etc. Ps. 35/8, the context requires that תִּלְכְּדוּ should be תִּלְכְּדֵם ('let it catch them').

Comparison of ו with נ (or ן) shows considerable likeness between their respective forms in the alphabets used during different periods. In II. Sam. 12/18, at the close, besides changing וְאֵיךְ into וְאִם, וְעָשָׂה should be corrected into נַעֲשֶׂה, so that the whole clause may run thus, 'And if we shall say to him, 'The child is dead', we shall do evil'; in Jer, 2/24, for תַּאֲוָתָהּ read תַּאֲנָתָהּ ('her lust'); in Mic. 5/6, by changing the unsuitable form יְקוֶּה ('expecteth') into יִקְנֶה, the

---

[1] The Note-line in verse 7 is to be observed. This rare word הַקְלָקֵל appeares in Num. 21/5.

whole clause presents the appropriate meaning, 'which cannot be bought by the sons of men'. In Isa. 5/10, a more appropriate form than הַשָּׁוְא is the resemblant הַשֹּׂנֵא ('one who hates').

The possibility of confusion between ו and פ becomes evident when comparison is made between the respective forms of these letters found in the Mesha Inscription as well as in the Pheonician, the Egyptian-Aramaic and other old Semitic alphabets. There is thus ground for believing that in Ps. 44/5 the questionable imperative צַוֵּה ('command') should rather be the participle צֹפֶה ('watching for'); and that similarly, in Amos 5/11, מְצַוֶּה ('commanding') is a mistranscription of מְצַפֶּה, which makes the clause mean, 'Behold, the Lord is watching'; in Ps. 34/6 (end) also, the verb-form יֶחְפָּרוּ signifying disappointment showing itself in the looks of those whose expectations have not been fulfilled, may be a mistranscription of the rarer form יֶחְוָרוּ (cf. Isa. 29/22) with a similar application, but signifying whiteness. Similarly, in Ps. 71/3, צִוִּיתָה should be צָפִיתָ (thou hast been watching for deliverance).

A glance will show that, in the Modern Hebrew alphabet, if the head of ו be extended laterally, or the top of ר be diminished, one of them might readily be mistaken for the other; like similarity obtains in some of the more ancient alphabets, particularly the Egyptian Aramaic; substitution of one letter for the other is apparent in the work of the Greek translators. In Hos. 6/9, חֶבֶר ('company') is represented in the Septuagint by ἔκρυφαν, i. e. חָבוּ ('they hid'); in Isa. 28/10, צַו לָצָו ('precept to precept') has been rendered by Θλίψιν ἐπὶ θλίψιν, i. e. צָר לָצָר ('affliction on affliction'). In I.Sam. 14/47, as now agreed by most critics יַרְשִׁיעַ ('he condemned') does not suit the context, and moreover stands without the accusative required to complete the idea inherent in the verb; the Septuagint, however, in

the corresponding form ἐδώξετο, represents the Hebrew term יִגָּשֵׁעַ, which may safely be accepted as the correct reading, inasmuch as it concludes the verse with the fitting statement that Saul, in all the battles fought with hostile nations around Israel, 'was preserved'. In Isa. 24 1, after beginning is made with the declaration that the Lord will make the land empty and lay it waste, there follows the strange expression וְעִוָּה פָּנֶיהָ ('and will invert its face'); by changing the verb-form, however, into its more appropriate resemblant וְעֵרָה, the sense becomes, 'and will bare its face' (cf. the Septuagint καὶ ἀνακαλύψει); In Isa. 42 11 (at end), יְצֻוָּחוּ is clearly a mistranscription of יְצֻרָּחוּ or יַצְרִיחוּ ('let them shout'); when either of these forms is substituted, it at once falls into line with יַצְרִיחַ in verse 13; but this warrantable change involves complete removal, from our Hebrew lexicons, of an unique verb-form together with the associated noun-form צְוָחָה, which becomes צְרָחָה ('a shout'), Isa. 24 11; Ps. 144/2; Jer. 14/2; 46 12. Isa. 3 6 for בְּאָחִיו read probably, בְּאַחֵר ('o n a n o t h e r'). Isa. 7 7 for תָּקוּם read תִּקְרַם ('thou shalt not go out to meet them in battle'). Ps. 42 10; should אוֹמְרָה be אֶשָּׁמְרָה ('I shall be preserved').

(g) Between ז and נ there is more similarity of appearance in the modern than in the ancient alphabets; defective formation of the former of these two letters would naturally lead transcribers to mistake it for the other. In Job 8/17, יֶחֱזֶה ('he will see') is represented in the Septuagint by ζήσεται, i. e. יְחֶיֶה ('he will live'). In Jer. 15 19, according to the Massoretic text, the prophet is addressed by the Lord in these words, 'If thou wilt bring out the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth'; but by changing כְּפִי into its resemblant כְּפַז, the sense of the closing expression becomes 'like pure gold', and the whole is seen to be a divine command—containing an allusion to the refining of precious metal—that the prophet should cast aside every

mean and earthly desire or inclination, and purify himself wholly for divine service.

Though there is very little resemblance of form, except to a small extent in Egyptian-Aramaic between ז and כ, confusion between them has occasionally arisen, as in Ps. 63/3, where the inappropriate verb-form חֲזִיתִךָ ('I have seen thee') should be חִכִּיתִיךָ ('I have waited for thee'). In Ex. 19/22 and 24, it is surprising to read in the Massoretic text of the 'priests' drawing near to the Lord, seeing that the priests were not set apart till later (see chap. 28); the correct term, however, זְקֵנִים, appears previously in verse 7, instead of כֹּהֲנִים; Aquila in his Version corroborates the proper reading.

Only in later script do ז and ל exhibit resemblant features calculated to mislead transcribers; instances of actual confusion are thus comparatively few. In Jud. 6/26, for the unsuitable expression הַמָּעוֹז הַזֶּה ('this fortress') read הַמַּעֲלֵה הַזֶּה ('this height'); in Hab. 3/16, for לְעַם ('to the people'), it is better to read זַעַם ('righteous wrath') (of God); in Ex. 15/13, for the disturbing factor בְּעָזְּךָ (in thy strength'), read the resemblant בְּעָלְךָ ('thine aroused') which satisfies the requirements of parallelism.

Little resemblance obtains, in any of the Semitic alphabets, between the forms of ז and מ (or ם); yet a few instances appear in which one has been mistaken for the other. Thus in Mic. 3/4, the opening term אָז ('Then') should rather be the conditional אִם ('If', or 'When'); in Hab. 3/17, גָּזַר, which elsewhere (see Ps. 136/13; II. Kings 6/4) bears a transitive sense ('cut asunder') or ('cut down'), must, if retained here, have a neuter or even passive signification ('fails', or 'be cut off'), but the difficulty is more simply and reasonably solved by substituting the resemblant and fitting form גָּמַר, which makes the clause mean ('the flock fails from the fold'). More drastic measures are required at the opening of Isa. 5/9, where בְּאָזְנַי (with two succeeding words giving

the unsatisfactory sense, 'In mine ears, (saith) the Lord of hosts') should be replaced by the familiar formula כֹּה אָמַר, so that the meaning may become, 'Thus saith the Lord of Hosts'. Isa. 5/14, (near end) for וְעָלַז read יֵעָלֵם ('shall be hidden'). Ps. 68/28, רִגְזָתָם should be רִגְמָתָם 'their cause of trembling'.

The forms of ז and נ (or ן) approximate only in alphabets of later times, when therefore mistranscription of words would mostly originate. In Prov. 10/31, the verb-form יָנוּב makes the first clause mean, rather unsuitably, 'the mouth of a righteous man buddeth with wisdom', but change of the form to its resemblant יָזוּב gives more appropriate sense, 'The mouth of a righteous man flows with wisdom'. In Ps. 31/3 occurs the expression לְצוּר מָעוֹז ('for a rock of refuge'); but in Ps. 71/3 this has been mistranscribed as לְצוּר־מָעוֹן ('for a rock of habitation'); in both passages for לָצוּר read לָעִיר ('for a city'). Similarly, the context seems to show that the closing term in Ps. 91/9 מְעוֹנֶךָ ('thy habitation') should rather be מְעוּזֶךָ ('thy refuge', or 'thy fortress').

At certain points, ז and ר, in later Hebrew alphabets, show some similarity calculated to mislead transcribers and confusion certainly has arisen in some cases. In Ezek. 1/14, בְּזָק should be בְּרָק ('lightning'); in Jer. 19/9; Dan. 10/5, אוּפָז should be אוֹפִיר, the locality which produced gold, precious stones, and sandal-wood (see I. Kings 9/28; 10/11; Job 28/16; 45/10 etc.) in Num. 11/13, instead of the questionable verb-form in the expression וַיָּזֶג שַׂלְוִים, after the statement that the Lord sent a wind to bring flesh to the discontented Israelites in the wilderness, it is better to read the resemblant וַיְגָרֶשׁ, so as to secure the sense, 'and it drove quails' from the sea.

(h) Though little resemblance obtains between ח and ט in any of the Semitic alphabets, confusion between the two has sometimes arisen. In Isa. 51/6 occurs the unique Niphal form נִמְלָחוּ, forming the predicate in a clause which

is held to mean 'the heavens vanish away like smoke'; but the Massoretic reading may safely be regarded as a scribal error for יִמָּלְטוּ, which is amply substantiated by cognate forms occurring elsewhere (see Jud. 3/26; Ps. 124/7; Amos 9/1; Mal. 3 15 etc.) In Zeph. 2/2, the triple occurrence of the form בְּטֶרֶם intensifies the despair of expositors in dealing with a passage sorely damaged at other points, but much relief is experienced and the demands of Hebrew grammar somewhat satisfied by substituting the resemblant בְּחֵרֶם ('with utter destruction'). In Job 9/26, for the יָטוּשׁ ἅπαξ λεγόμενον read יָחוּשׁ ('hastens'); cf. Hab. 1/8; Isa. 7/2, for נָחָה read נָטָה ('is (favourably) inclined to').

Between ח and י in the modern Hebrew alphabet there is anything but similarity; but, in the Samaritan characters and those on the Mesha Stone, an imperfectly formed ח may readily be mistaken for the other. Instances of confusion between these two letters, in the Massoretic Text, occur in Prov. 1/26, 27, where פַּחְדְּכֶם ('your dread') should be פִּידְכֶם ('your disaster'), as required by the context, and as shown by the Septuagint rendering (ὄλεθρος); and in 3/25, מִפַּחַד, should be מִפִּיד; further, in 14/15, יָבִין ('he perceived' should rather be יִבְחַן ('he tests', or 'proves').

ח and ל. Only in the Palmyrene characters does there appear a small amount of resemblance to warrant the conclusion that one of these letters might possibly be mistaken for the other. In Ps. 74/19 (end), for לָנֶצַח read לָנֶצֶל to give the sense 'do not forget to d e l i v e r'.

The forms of ח and מ (or ם) in some of the later Semitic alphabets show considerable similarity, so that substitution of one letter for the other has sometimes taken place. In I. Sam. 5/3, at the close, it is stated the Philistines 'took' Dagon, their idol, which was fallen down before the ark of the Lord, and restored it to its place, but as the expression in the Greek Version, corresponding to וַיִּקָּחוּ is

καὶ ἤγειραν, which represents וַיָּקִימוּ ('and they raised up'), this form should be substituted in the Hebrew text; conversely in Amos 2/11, instead of וָאָקִים ('and I raised up') the correct reading is וָאֶקַּח ('and I took'), as indicated by καὶ ἔλαβον in the Septuagint. In Isa. 28/16, at the close, it is stated that 'he who believeth shall not make haste', but as the first part of the verse tells of a stone laid as a sure foundation, it is highly probable that יָחִישׁ should rather be יָמוּשׁ ('be moved'). In Ps. 18/2, the form אֶרְחָמְךָ ('I will love thee') wrongly translated, should be ('I will have pity upon thee') and is hardly appropriate, in the mouth of a creature addressing the Creator, and should rather be the resemblant אֲרוֹמִמְךָ ('I will exalt thee') which occurs in Ps. 30/2. In Ps. 40/16, where יָשֹׁמּוּ is too strong a term to suit the context, substitute יָשְׁחוּ or יִשַּׁחוּ ('let them be humbled').

Though ח and נ show scant resemblance of form in any of the Semitic alphabets, though some degree of likeness appears in the Palmyrene and in the Egyptian-Aramaic characters, several instances occur in which one has been substituted for the other. Prov. 31/16, describing the skill and foresight of the excellent woman in managing the affairs of household, tells how she examines a field carefully and then acquires it; instead of the somewhat commonplace verb-form וַתִּקָּחֵהוּ ('and takes it'), it is better to read the resemblant וַתִּקְנֵהוּ ('and buys it'). In the latter half of Amos 3/8, where a simple rendering of the Massoretic text is 'the Lord hath spoken: who will not prophesy?' it is surely necessary to change the closing term יִנָּבֵא into its resemblant יֵחָבֵא ('hide himself'), in order to restore the parallelism between the two parts of the verse (compare the first half). Deut. 21/14, gives directions regarding the treatment of a wife divorced merely because the affection of her husband has cooled; according to the Massoretic text, it is ordained that she should be sent away according

to her desire (English Versions 'whither she will'); the Septuagint, however, in the term ἐλευθέραν, confirmed by the Vulgate l i b e r a m, shows that לְנַפְשָׁהּ should rather be לַחָפְשִׁיָּה ('free'); see the construction in Ex. 21/2, 26, 27. Isa. 5 18 for מֹשְׁכֵי read חֹשְׂכֵי ('hinder') as the context points to those who p r e v e n t meek oppressed ones from doing work imposed on them. Ps. 68/17, for גֶּצַח, read רָצוֹן ('pleasure'). In Ps. 74/10 (end) the unsatisfactory לָנֶצַח may more suitably give place to לְרָצוֹן ('a t p l e a s u r e').

Only in the Palmyrene characters can a slight resemblance of form be perceived between ח and צ, yet this similarity may suffice for holding that בָּאָרֶץ in Ps. 57/5, where the Note-line precedes the form, might preferably be read as בָּאֹרַח—the succeeding verb-form תַּנְחֵם being also changed to תַּנְחֶה—so that the whole clause may more fitly be rendered 'and unenlightened tribes thou shalt entirely lead in the right way'. Ps. 68 7 for סוֹרְרִים ('rebels') read סוֹרְחִים ('s u r p l u s ones') dwell ('temporarily').

The forms of ח and ס show no resemblance in earlier alphabets, and only slight similarity in those of later times; some instances of confusion, however, do occur. Amos. 9 2, according to the Massoretic text, begins with a divine declaration regarding guilty ones in Israel, 'If they dig into Sheol, thence will my hand take them'; but as digging, in such a connection, is strange, the verb-form יַחְתְּרוּ may safely be regarded as a scribal error for the resemblant יַסְתְּרוּ ('hide themselves'), which indeed is indicated by κατακρύβωσιν in the Septuagint; in Hab. 2/17, the unworkable form יְחִיתֵן ought surely to be יַסִּיתֵךְ ('shall incite thee').

Likeness between ח and ת is obvious enough in the modern Hebrew alphabet, and—though in a less degree—in the Palmyrene characters also, but similarity can hardly be traced in the earlier scripts; hence, confusion between

these two letters could hardly have arisen till after the Alexandrian translation was executed. Instances of misreading occur in Num. 32/42, where the personal name נֹבַח is represented in the Septuagint by Ναβωθ, and in 33/27, 28, where the local name תָּרַח appears as Ταραθ in the Greek Version. In Ps. 91/8, the unique form סֹחֵרָה, which, through mere conjecture based on the context, is alleged to mean 'a buckler', is rather to be regarded as a transcriptional error for סְתָרָה ('a covert'). Several cases occur in which derivatives of the root שָׁבַח ('praise') have been substituted for others from שָׁבַת ('rest', 'cease'); in Ps. 65/7, מַשְׁבִּיחַ (with a querying Note-line following), telling of the power of the Almighty in stilling the raging of the seas should rather be מַשְׁבִּית; similarly, in Ps. 89/10, תְּשַׁבְּחֵם should be תַּשְׁבִּיתֵם ('thou stillest them'); in Prov. 29/11, picturing the prudence of a wise man as in no haste to tell all that is in his mind, יְשַׁבְּחֶנָּה should be יַשְׁבִּיתֶנָּה ('he keepeth it quite'); In Nah. 3/10, describing the fate of No-Ammon in Egypt, whose magnates were carried captive in chains by the conquerors, the questionable form רֻתְּקוּ should rather be רֻחֲקוּ ('were carried far away').

(i) In their modern forms, ט and י could hardly be mistaken, one for the other; even in earlier alphabets, these letters show as little resemblance that interchange could not often occur; only in the Moabite and the Palmyrene characters may be traced slight similarity which might lead transcribers to substitute one letter for the other. In Isa. 21/4, however, the context seems to warrant the conclusion that the second of the two combined forms נֶשֶׁף חִשְׁקִי ('evening of my delight') should rather be נַשֶּׁקֶט, which, when substituted, presents the more appropriate idea 'an evening of quiet'. To satisfy the requirements of parallelism in Ps. 78/68, the mention of 'mount' Zion in the latter half of the verse leads us to expect some other noun than שֵׁבֶט ('tribe')

as a fitting conclative in the first half ; most probably, the form required is the resemblant שְׁפִי ('a treeless mountain').

Between ט and ל, hardly any resemblance appears in any of the alphabets except the Palmyrene, and even in this the similarity is slight ; cases nevertheless occur in which one of these letters has evidently been mistaken for the other. In Ps. 89/40, the unsuitable form חִלַּלְתָּ ('thou hast profaned') should rather be הִטַּלְתָּ ('thou hast cast down'); similarly, in Ps. 74/7, a better reading than חִלְלוּ ('they have profaned') is הֵטִילוּ ('they have thrown down'). In Isa. 53/4, חֳלָיֵנוּ ('our sicknesses') is changed by Grätz into חֲטָאֵנוּ ('our sins') a reading confirmed by the Septuagint and Symmachus (τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν) ; hence also, in Isa. 33/24, as the context mentions forgiveness of iniquity, חָלִינוּ ('we are sick') should probably be חָטָאנוּ ('we have sinned'). In Lev. 19/19, in which the wearing of clothes is mentioned, יַעֲלֶה should rather be יַעֲטֶה ('cover') ; similarly in Amos 9/10, וְהֶעֱלֵיתִי ('and I will bring up') should be וְהֶעֱטֵיתִי ('and I will cover') ; in Isa. 32/13. describing cultivable land as overgrown with thorns and briars, for תַּעֲלֶה read תַּעֲטֶה ('cover'). Ps. 9/20 for יִשְׁפֹּט read יִשְׁפֹּל ('let them be abased'). Isa. 3/6 for שִׁמְלָה read שִׁמְטָה neglect is theirs.

The forms of ט and מ (or ם), especially in the earlier alphabets, show little resemblance, yet exchange of one for the other seems occasionally to have taken place. The textual difficulties are accordingly removed by the restoration of a fitting letter. In Ps. 118/10, 11, 12, the form אֲמִילֵם, repeated in each of these verses, bears a stronger meaning ('I will cut them off') than seems necessary in a passage in which the Psalmist expressed confidence in completely overcoming his enemies ; most probably the reading is rather אֲטִילֵם ('I will cast them down'). In Job 1/17, describing the Chaldean's attack on Job's property, it is stated that 'they made (or 'set') three bands', but as the

verb-form שָׁמוּ has been queried through the insertion of the Note-line, the correct reading may rather be שָׁטוּ, which would make the clause mean 'they ran about (in) three bands' (cf. 1/7 and 2/2). In Ps. 139/16, Wellhausen's ingenious suggestion that יָמִים ('days') should rather be טֶרֶם ('not yet') has much to commend it.

ט and נ these letters show hardly any resemblance to each other in any of the Semitic alphabets, yet in Ps. 28/5 (Note-line in some MSS.) for יָבִינוּ read יַבִּיטוּ (look).

Only in later alphabets do ט and ס exhibit some resemblance ; that one of them must have been occasionally mistaken for the other seems sufficiently substantiated by the improved sense obtained when reversed substitution is made in certain passages of the Massoretic text. In Zach. 1/17, predicting the expansion of Jerusalem after its restoration, for מְטוֹב read מֵסַב ('round about') ; and in Mic. 1/4, for וְנָמַסּוּ ('and they shall melt') read וְנָמֹטוּ ('and they shall totter'),—a predication applied to mountains in other passages (Ps. 46/3 ; Isa. 54/10).

The forms of ט and ע, in many of the Semitic alphabets, present common features which readily conduce to confusion of one letter with the other. In Prov. 19/27, לִשְׁמֹעַ ('to hear') is inappropriate but the substitution of its resemblant לִשְׁמֹט ('to neglect') is unexceptionable ; in Jud. 11/10, instead of שֹׁמֵעַ ('hearing'), a more fitting term is שֹׁפֵט ('judging') ; in Num. 11/2, referring to a fire, the form וַתִּשְׁקַע ('and it sunk down', properly, 'and it was submerged') should rather be וַתִּשְׁקֹט ('and it quieted down') ; in Ps. 76/9, the closing form וְשָׁקְטָה ('and became silent') should rather be וְשָׁקְעָה ('and sunk down').

Resemblance between ט and ק is obvious in the Samaritan alphabet, but in no other. Only a few instances occur in which these letters have apparently been interchanged : thus I. Sam. 4/2, forming part of the account of a war between

Israelites and Philistines, tells—according to the Massoretic text and a common interpretation—that the battle 'was spread'; by changing the questionable verb-form וַתִּטֹּשׁ, however, into its resemblant וַתִּקֹּשׁ, there is obtained a more appropriate rendering,—'and the battle was fierce'. In Jer. 10/4, the questionable verb-form יָפִיק at the close might rather be יָמוּט, which more certainly bears the meaning ('move') required by the context.

ט and ש confused—in Ps. 80/6, for שָׁלִישׁ read שַׁלִּיט despot, tyrant.

(j) Unlike as they are in several alphabets, י and ל show close resemblance in the characters employed about the Christian Era; proofs of interchange are fairly numerous. In Gen. 31/25, אֶחָיו ('his brethern') is an obvious transcriptional error for אָהֳלוֹ ('his tent'), which appears previously in the same verse; in Num. 25/4, the very same mistake occurs; in I. Sam. 14/33, where the Massoretic text shows הַיּוֹם ('to-day'), the Septuagint translator wrote ἐνταῦθα, representing הֲלוֹם ('hither'), which probably is the preferable reading; in Ps. 19/28, instead of יְבַלַּע ('swalloweth'), the context, as Frankerberg pointed out, requires יַבִּיעַ ('poureth forth'), similarly, in Prov. 21/20, יְבַלְּעֶנּוּ should rather be יַבִּיעֶנּוּ ('will blurt it out'); in Hos. 7/2, for כָּל ('all'), read כִּי ('that'); in Gen. 9/20, for the troublesome form וַיָּחֶל ('and Noah commenced (to be) a husbandman'), read the simpler וַיְהִי ('and he became. . . . .'). In Gen. 19/15 for the questionable וַיְאִיצוּ read the Piel וַיְאַלְּצוּ ('and they urged').

Incredible as it may seem to one who is acquainted only with the modern Hebrew characters, confusion of י with מ (ם) will be recognised as more than possible after examination is made of earlier alphabets. In I. Kings 1/25, the Note-line has rightly been inserted by an observant scribe, before יָרַד, to indicate that this is too colourless a term ('he hath gone down') to apply to Adonijah's conduct;

but substitution of מָרַד ('he hath rebelled') forms a satisfactory correction. A double illustration appears in Joel 4/21, where, as most critics agree, וְנִקֵּתִי . . . . נִקֵּתִי ('and I will absolve. . .') should certainly be changed to וְנִקַּמְתִּי . . . נִקַּמְתִּי, when the whole clause will mean 'and I will avenge bloodshed (which) I have not avenged'. In Num. 11/15, (at end), as Grätz points out, the form בְּרָעָתִי must be regarded as an error for בְּרָעָתָם, inasmuch as the evil plight is not that of Moses but of the people. In Amos 5/14 the concluding form אֲמַרְתֶּם ('ye have said') is inappropriate, but אָמַרְתִּי ('I have said') gives the sense required by the context. In Isa. 1/9 and again in Ps. 94/17 . . . passages forming conditional sentences of similar characters ('Unless. . . certainly now. . .') as obvious from the introductory לולי —the apodosis ordinarily requires, not כִּמְעַט, but כִּי עַתָּה [1], which should accordingly be restored in these verses (see Gen. 31/32). Isa. 7/7 for תִּהְיֶה read תֶּהֱמֶה ('thou must not be concerned'). Isa. 8/6 for the impracticable וּמְשׂוֹשׂ read וַיָּשׂוֹשׂ. Isa. 40/15 אִיִּים, read אֲמִים.

Between י and נ (ן) there is sufficient similarity in some alphabets to induce substitution of one of these letters for the other. Examples appear in Jer. 49/19, where the first כִּי should be כֵּן ('so'), to introduce the complement of the comparison ('as a lion (that) cometh up. . .') begun in the preceding part of the verse: כִּי (queried by the Note-line) at the beginning of Hos. 3/4, should be similarly corrected; conversely, in Ps. 127/2, כֵּן should be changed to כִּי ('because'); in Ps. 57/2, the s e c o n d חָנֵּנִי ('have mercy on me') to which attention is called by the Note-line) should rather be חַיֵּנִי ('revive me'); the same substitution seems required by the context in 41/11. Similarly at beginning of Isa. 9/4. In Ps. 38/20, instead of חַיִּים read חִנָּם ('without

---

[1] Sometimes כִּי אָז (as in II. Sam. 2/27) or אָז (as in Ps. 119/92).

cause'),as required by parallelism, and agreed by critics generally. In Isa. 5/12 ; Nah. 3/7, for וְהָיָה ('And it shall come to pass') read וְהִנֵּה ('And behold') ; in 4/4, for דְּמֵי ('bloodshed') read דֹּמֶן ('dung') which suits the parallelism.

Though י and צ are anything but resemblant in the modern Hebrew characters, close similarity is shown in some of the Samaritan ; substitution of one for the other is thus to be expected. In Ps. 91/7, מִצִּדֶּךָ ('by thy side'), which is queried by the Note-line, should rather be מִיָּדְךָ ('by thy hand') as required by the parallelism in the verse ; in Jer. 10/4, the unique Piel form יְיַפֶּהוּ ('he adorns it', viz. an idol of wood) should rather be יְיַצַּפֶּהוּ ('he overlays it') express mention being made of silver and gold as the metals with which it is plated ; in Hab. 1/9, יָבוֹא ('it comes') is too mild a term to be used in a passage describing the approach of the fierce Chaldean army, and should give place to צָבְאוּ (,they march' to war).

In the more modern Semitic alphabets, though not in the more ancient, י and ר display considerable similarity of form, so that one might readily be mistaken for the other. In Exod. 15/2, the Septuagint rendering of עָזִּי ('my strength'), viz. βοηθός, shows that the translator took the form to be עֹזֵר ('a helper') ; in Ps. 72/9, as shown by Olshausen, צִיִּים ('dwellers in a desert') must be changed to צָרִים ('adversaries'), or even to צָרָיו ('his adversaries') in order to restore the parallelism required in the verse ; in Prov. 13/7, for יֵשׁ ('there is') read רָשׁ ('a poor man') ; in I. Sam. 22/8, Weir and Driver rightly recommend the change of לְאֹרֵב ('for one lying in wait') into לְאוֹיֵב ('for an enemy') τῖς ἐχθρὸν being the Septuagint reading. Ps. 78/61, לַשָּׁבְי should rather be לַשֹּׁבֵר ('to the destroyer') as parallelism requires a person.

In none of the Semitic alphabets do י and ת show marked similarity of form ; but as one has indubitably,

though unaccountably, been substituted for the other in many instances, some of these are now given. In Isa 1/29, instead of יֵבֹשׁוּ ('they shall be ashamed') the context requires תֵּבֹשׁוּ ('ye shall be ashamed'), which is the actual reading in some codices; in Num. 35/30, instead of the inconvenient form יִרְצַח ('one shall kill'), it is better to read, in accordance with the Septuagint φονεύσεις, תִּרְצַח ('thou shalt kill'); in Amos 8/9, instead of בְּיוֹם אוֹר ('in a day of light') which hardly suits the context, read בְּתוֹם אוֹר ('in fulness of light'); in Ex. 5/16, for אֹמְרִים, a form which cannot easily be justified, substitute אֱמָרְתֶּם, so that the whole clause may mean, 'Yet bricks, ye say to us, make!' Isa. 7/20 (end) for תִּסְפֶּה read יִסְפֶּה ('he (the Lord) shall completely shave the beard'). Ps. 78/57, for כְּקֶשֶׁת like a bow read קְשָׁי, so as to get the thought of 'in hardness of neglect'. Ex. 25/3, and 26/31, for יַעֲשֶׂה read תַּעֲשֶׂה as in the previous context, Ex. 22/6 for תֵּצֵא read יֵצִית ('kindle'). Ps. 41/3 for תְּתַנְּהוּ put יִתְנֵהוּ (Ath. Version). Isa. 32/10 (end) for יָבוֹא read תְּבוּאָה ('a gathering without produce'). N. B. Ps. 82/5 the series of three consecutive verb-forms in the third person plural (יָדְעוּ etc.) should be in the second person (תֵּדָעוּ etc.) to accord with the close of verse 6 ('Ye . . . .'). A twofold error in transcribing has occurred in Isa. 53/10, where the questionable form תָּשִׂים, ('thou shalt') should rather be a verb-form in the third person singular, viz. יְשַׁלֵּם ('he shall pay').

Regarding the confusion between כ and ב, see page 42.

(k) In the later Semitic alphabets כ and ל may readily be mistaken, one for the other, especially when, in the modern character, the top of the latter is unduly shortened or has become indistinct; instances of this confusion are fairly numerous. In Isa. 22/21, the Septuagint rendering of לְאָב ('for a father'), viz. ὡς πατὴρ, shows that the translator read the form before him as כְּאָב ('as a father'); similarly,

in Jer. 1/18, לְעִיר ('for a city') is represented in the Greek Version by ὡς πολιν, the equivalent of כְּעִיר ('like a city'); in Isa. 42/3, לֶאֱמֶת ('to truth') should rather be בֶּאֱמֶת ('according to truth'); a twofold confusion appears in Prov. 14/7, where לֵךְ (,go') is represented in the Septuagint by πὰντα, i. e. כֹּל [1], ('all'). In Zach. 10/12, describing the condition of redeemed and restored Israel, instead of the Massoretic form יִתְהַלְּכוּ, which represents them as 'Walking up and down' in the name of the Lord, it is certainly better to substitute יִתְהַלְּלוּ, as indicated by the Septuagint κευχήσονται, so that the meaning may become 'they shall glory in His name', (cf. Ps. 34/3 ; 64/11 ; 105/3). In Jud. 4/18, describing how Jael covered the wearied fugitive Sisera in her tent, for the unique and irreducible form בַּשְּׂמִיכָה, substitute בַּשִּׂמְלָה ('with the mantle'); in Ps. 3/9, for the questionable סֶלָה at the close, restore סַכָּה, so that the latter part of the verse may mean, 'thy blessing protecteth thy people'. In II. Sam. 14/16, if the initial term כִּי, which is hardly suitable there, be displaced by the resemblant לוּ, the verse appropriately begins thus, 'O that the King would hear', (as in Gen. 17/18 ; 30/34). (On confusion of ו with י, see page 65) by a similar substitution in Ruth 1/12, כִּי אָמַרְתִּי should more fitly give the required sense ('If I said') and in Ex. 9/14 the meaning similarly to be obtained is, 'If I were to read'. Ps. 66/7 for מֹשֵׁל ('too mild') read מֹסֵךְ (seizing)—trick—stars. Ps. 68/22 for כְּמַהֲלֵךְ read כְּמַהֲלֵל ('glorying').

In all the Semitic alphabets ,כ and מ (ם)[2] exhibit such close similarity that substitution of one for the other is very frequent. In I. Kings 1/47, the Massoretes note that instead of אֱלֹהֶיךָ , אֱלֹהִים is the correct form. In Prov. 11/15,

---

1) See foot-note on page 62.

2) See remarks regarding the final forms of these letters at pages 82, 92.

a more appropriate form than כִּי is מִי ('whoever'); similarly, in Mic. 1/12, at the beginning, the Septuagint translator, by his rendering (τίς), shows that he read כִּי as מִי ('who?'); in Ez. 33/22, the unique and troublesome form וְשַׂכֹּתִי (alleged to mean 'and I will cover'), read וְשַׂמְתִּי ('and I will place'); in Zeph. 3/7 and Prov. 17/11, for אַךְ ('surely') read אִם ('if'). Conversely, in Jer. 12/6 for מָלְאוּ read כָּלְאוּ ('hold') and in 6/11, where the Note-line has been inserted, for מָלֵאתִי, read כָּלָאתִי ('I have restrained'); in Ps. 28/11; and 143/9, for וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי ('and I become like'), read וְנִכְשַׁלְתִּי ('and I sink down'), which in both passages suits the context better; in Ps. 17/7, for the simple participle חֹסִים ('those who trust'), the Greek translator, supported by the Syriac and other Versions, shows by his rendering (τοὺς ἐλπίζοντας ἐπί σε) that he read the suffixed form חֹסֶיךָ ('those who trust in thee'). Obviously also, there might easily take place a confusion of ך (pronominal suffix of the second person singular) with ם (suffix of the third person plural, masculine), as in Ps. 81/17. end, where the correct reading, אַשְׂבִּיעֵם, is confirmed by the Septuagint and the Peshito.

Likeness between כ and נ is patent in most of the Semitic alphabets that substitution of one letter for the other is not surprising. In Ps. 143/9, for the impossible form כִּסִּיתִי ('I have covered'), which is associated with the suffixed preposition 'unto thee', read נַסְתִּי ('I have fled', as rightly indicated in the Septuagint by the corresponding term κατέφυγον); in II. Kings 14/10 is found the expression הַכֵּה הִכִּיתָ ('thou hast utterly smitten'), while the reading in the parallel passage, II. Chr. 25/19, is הִנֵּה הִכִּיתָ ('behold, thou hast smitten'); in Josh.18/13, for וַיֵּלֶךְ ('and he went'), which hardly suits the context, Ben Asher proposes וַיָּלֶן ('and he spent the night') which is confirmed in verse 9; in Mic. 1/10; the Massoretic reading אַל תִּבְכּוּ ('weep not') is represented in the Septuagint by μὴ ἀνοικοδομεῖτε, i. e.

תִּבְנוּ ('do not rebuild') ; in Mic. 2/4 ; אֵיךְ ('how') has been read as אֵין (οὐκ ἦν, 'there was not').

Between כ and ס, in some of the later Semitic alphabets there is enough of similarity to allow for error in transcription. In Gen. 14/10, mention of flight from the battlefield is premature, hence וַיָּנֻסוּ ('and they fled') must rather be וַיֻּכּוּ ('and they were smitten'); the flight of the defeated remnant is naturally mentioned later, at the end of the verse. In I. Kings 7/40 הַכִּירוֹת should be הַסִּירוֹת ('the pots') as in verse 45 and in the parallel II. Chr. 4/11, 16, and some Hebrew Codices ; I. Sam. 2/14 בַּכִּיּוֹר ('laver' for 'washing in') (or כִּיּוֹר) is unsuitable, read בַּסִּיר ('pot'). In Zach. 14/20, where the sadly disfigured expression עַל מְצִלּוֹת הַסּוּס, which cannot satisfactorily be explained to suit the context, obviously describing conditions under which emergency arrangements would be made for an exceptional Feast of Tabernacles, the correct reading is undoubtedly the resemblant כָּל מַקְלוֹת הַסּוֹךְ ('all the rough rods of the booth'). In Ps. 7/6, at the close, as also in Ps. 32/4, 5, 7, as well as in many other passages, the questionable form סֶלָה may fitly be set aside in favour of כָּלָה ('completely'); at the end of 143/6 ; the same intractable form may reasonably be changed to the feminine participle כֹּלָה ('languishing') and taken as referring to 'my soul'. Ps. 119/118 ; the סָלִיתָ (guessed to be 'thou hast trampled under foot', or 'thou hast despised, made light of') should rather be כִּלָּה ('thou hast put an end to'). In I. Sam. 2/14, הַכִּוֹרוֹת ('in the large bronze laver') should rather be הַסִּירוֹת ('in the part (on the fire)') ; and in Lam. 1/15, the Piel סִלָּה, similarly, should be כִּלָּה ('he hath made an end of').

ך and ץ. In the Egyptian-Aramaic alphabet characters, the forms of these two letters are so similar that one might readily be substituted for the other ; thus, in Ps. 67/5, by

changing בָּאָרֶץ ('in the earth') might fitly be read as בְּאוֹרְךָ ('in thy light').

The respective forms of כ and פ, especially in the later Semitic alphabets, are peculiarly liable to be confused, because of their obvious similarity. Hence כֹּה ('thus') has been wrongly written for פֹּה ('here') in Gen. 31/37, II. Sam. 18/3, and other passages; double illustrations of the error (viz. כֹּה . . . . פֹּה for פֹּה . . . . פֹּה) occur in Num. 11/31; 23/15; etc.; moreover, אֵיכָה ('how?' as in Deut. 1/12; 7/17 etc.) has been incorrectly written for אֵיפֹה ('where?') in Cant. 1 7 (twice); for the irreducible form כִּידוֹ in Job. 21/20 rightly divined from the context to mean 'his destruction (misfortune)', פִּידוֹ should be substituted.

As כ and ר show considerable resemblance, particularly in the later Semitic alphabets, instances of mistranscription are only to be expected. In Ps. 18/12 appears the poetic expression חֶשְׁכַת מַיִם ('darkness of waters', i. e. dark waters), but in the parallel passage, II. Sam. 22/12, the reading is חַשְׁרַת מַיִם (which is alleged by some expositors, from consideration of the Arabic, to mean 'A mass of waters'); in II. Sam. 23/33, there occurs the proper name שרר, whereas שכר in the form found in the parallel passage, בָּרוּךְ ('blessed'), should rather be בָּרוּר ('blameless') a term there applied by Solomon to himself, as contrasted with the guilty Shimei; in Prov. 11/15, the Septuagint translator has doubtless read זָר ('a stranger') as זַךְ ('pure'), of which δίκαιος may be accepted as a fair rendering.

Only in the more ancient Semitic alphabets do כ and ש display some resemblance, and this at the upper portion of the former, which is like the latter. Such similarity sufficiently warrants the assumption that substitution of one letter for the other has taken place in some passages which hardly commend themselves as correct. In Ps. 8/4, the context, in which mention is made of 'Moon' and 'stars', suggests that שָׂמִיךָ

('thy heaven') should rather be the resemblant שֶׁמֶשׁ ('sun'). In Ps. 10,4, the Massoretic reading בַּל יִדְרֹשׁ ('do not seek'), which requires an object to complete the idea inherent in the verb, and can hardly be defended, should rather be בָּל יִדְרֹךְ ('treadeth on everyone'); see Isa. 63,3. In Jer. 32/39, there is a promise by the Lord that He will give to His people, when restored to their own land, 'one heart and one way'; as it is not easy, however, to see how a 'way' could be given to them, or how this can fitly be combined in thought with 'heart', there is good reason for assuming that דֶּרֶךְ is a scribal error for a lost term דֶּרֶשׁ, which, when substituted, would make the passage mean, 'I will give them one heart and one desire, to fear me'. Num. 25/1, 5 briefly narrates how certain Israelites were induced by Moabitish woman to have sinful intercourse with them and to worship their idols; for this transgression, according to the Massoretic reading, the guilty ones were to be hanged before the Lord 'against the sun' (verse 4); assuming, however, that the expression נֶגֶד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ should rather be נֶגֶד כְּמוֹשׁ, there is obtained the more probable statement that the sinners were executed 'in view of Chemosh', the national God of the Moabites which they had worshipped, but which they found, too late, could not save them.

In later Hebrew script, כ and ת show considerable resemblance when the foot-line of the former has become indistinct or has disappeared. The verb nearly everywhere in use for signifying to 'break' or 'annul' a covenant in the Hiphil of פָּרַר (see Isa. 33,18; Jer. 14/21; 31,32; 33,20, 21; Ezek. 16/59; 17,15,18,19 etc.); when, therefore, the expression וְכֻפַּר בְּרִיתְכֶם occurs in Isa. 28 18, where the context certainly requires some such meaning as 'your covenant shall be annulled', though the verb-form actually here would naturally mean 'and it shall be covered', and is, besides, in the masculine, though it should be feminine to agree with

the gender of its subject,—there need be no hesitation in substituting תּוּפַר, which solves the difficulty. In a prayer of David recounting the Lord's mercy to him and his people, there occurs, according to the Massoretic text of I. Chr. 17/22, the questionable expression, 'and thou didst give thy people Israel to thyself for a people forever' ; but if, instead of the verb-form וַתִּתֵּן, there be substituted the resemblant וַתָּכֶן (Hiph. of כּוּן), this will present the more appropriate meaning 'and thou didst appoint'. In Hos. 9/13, for the expression לְצוֹר שְׁתוּלָה בְּנָוֶה,—which has been so sadly deformed, like its context, as to leave most interpreters in despair—read the resemblant כְּצִפּוֹר שְׁכוּלַת בָּנֶיהָ, 'like a hen-bird deprived of her brood'. Afterwards, in Hos 9/14, for מַה תִּתֵּן ('what wilt thou give'), substitute מַה יִתָּכֵן ('whatis right', or 'equitable' ; see Ezek. 18/25 ; 33/17, 20).

(l) The close resemblance between the forms of ל and מ in some alphabets, especially the Palmyrene, is calculated to mislead copyists, and thus conduce to substitution of one for the other. Instances of erroneous transcription are found in Ps. 31/12, where the opening form מִכֹּל, as Houbigant noted, should be לְכֹל ('to all'), which restores the parallelism expected in the verse. In Ps. 63/2, the unique and questionable form כָּמָה is probably a mistranscription of כָּלָה ('is consumed' or 'perisheth') ; a similar expression, supporting this reading, appears in Ps. 73/26. Ps. 68/21, as לַמָּוֶת ('to death') gives no suitable sense, put מִמָּוֶת ('from death') cf. 70. In Ps. 107/29, instead of יָקֶם ('He raiseth' a storm), read either יָקֵל ('He lightens' a storm), or יֵקַל (a storm 'is lightened') ; in Ps. 121/3 t w i c e for the merely dissuasive negative אַל, which is far too weak, substitute אִם, which secures the strong meaning required ('assuredly He shall not . . . ' cf. Ps. 95/11 ; 132/3, 4 ; Num. 14/23 ; Gen. 14/22 etc.) ; in Gen. 13/11, and Isa. 7/17 מֵעַל ('from upon') should

rather be מֵעִם ('from with') ; in Ex. 15/13, for נָהַלְתָּ ('thou didst lead'), the Septuagint translator, by his rendering παρεκάλεσας, shows that he read the form as נִחַמְתָּ ('thou didst encourage') ; see a similar rendering in Isa. 51/18. In Ps. 119/111, the verb-form נָחַלְתִּי should rather be the resemblant noun-form נֶחָמָתִי ('my comfort').

Similarity, in the later Semitic alphabets, between some forms of ל and נ, has caused considerable confusion in transcription. A term of frequent occurrence in description of the Temple is לִשְׁכָּה ('a room', or 'chamber'), II. Kings 23/11 ; I. Chr. 9/26, 33 ; Ezek. 40/17, 45 ; Ezra 8/29 ; 10/6 ; Neh. 10/38,39 ; 13/5 etc. ; the form נִשְׁכָּה, however, appears in a few passages, Neh. 13/7 ; 3/30 ; 12/44. Ps. 78/66 for עוֹלָם read עֲוֹנָם (their iniquity). In I. Sam. 6/18, the form אָבֵל must certainly be changed to אֶבֶן ('stone'), as shown by verse 14, with which the Targum and the Septuagint agree. In II. Sam. 18/9, describing the miserable end of Absalom, when the head was caught in the branches of a tree from under which his mule ran away, the Massoretic text states that he was 'put between the heaven and the earth' ; if, however, וַיִּתֵּן be changed to the resemblant וַיִּתָּל (Niphal of תָּלָה) there is obtained the fitting statement 'and he was suspended between the heaven and the earth'. In Isa. 21/15, the expression חֶרֶב נְטוּשָׁה (doubtfully held to mean 'a drawn sword') should rather be חֶרֶב לְטוּשָׁה ('a sharpened sword'), as Grätz suggests ; in Nah. 2/13, the unsuitable form וּמְנַתֵּק ('and strangling') should rather be וּמְחַלֵּק ('and distributing'). In Ex. 22/10, וְלָקַח should be וְנָקָהוּ, which makes the clause mean 'then its owner shall absolve him'.

Except in the Palmyrene characters, there is little resemblance between the forms of ל and ס, so that cases of substitution are rare. In Hab. 2/17, instead of the statement 'violence shall cover thee', it is better, by changing יְכַסְּךָ into יְכַלֶּךָּ, to obtain the meaning, 'violence shall overcome

thee'); in Zach. 14/9, instead of לְמֶלֶךְ ('for a King'), the context requires לְמִסֵּךְ ('for a protector'). In Ps. 84/6, instead of the unworkable form מְסִלּוֹת, read תְּהִלּוֹת so that the rendering may become '(with) praises in their heart'.

ע and ל. Only in the Palmyrene alphabet is there any similarity of form between ל and ע, but the resemblance is so obvious that one must at once understand how readily these two letters would be mistaken, one for the other, by a transcriber. On this ground, the closing Massoretic form אֶשְׁמָע, in Ps. 81/6, may confidently be corrected to אֶתְמֹל, and thus aid in reducing the whole of the impracticable latter portion of the verse to harmony with what precedes. (See the later section on complicated cases).

Owing to similarity of form, in several Semitic alphabets, between ל and פ, instances of confusion are fairly numerous. In Ps. 6/2 מִכֹּל ('from all') should rather be מִכַּף ('from the hand', as in I. Sam. 4/3; II. Kings 16/7); in Ps. 109/23, for the unique and questionable form נֶהֱלַכְתִּי ('I am gone') substitute the resemblant נֶהֱפַכְתִּי ('I am changed'); in Zephan. 2/8 and 10, for וַיַּגְדִּילוּ ('and they have magnified') read the resemblant וַיְגַדְּפוּ ('and they have reviled'), to accord with the previous mention of reproaching; in Ps. 14/4 and 53/4, for the expression אֹכְלֵי עַמִּי ('those who devour my people') read אֹכְפֵי עָנִי ('those who burden an afflicted one'). As 'Judges' in a well-ordered country are normally persons of probity and superior intelligence, whose removal involves serious loss to the whole community, while others wielding power without possessing fitness for discharging the duties of an exalted position deserve to be abased, the construct form שִׁפְטֵי in Isa. 40/23 should rather be the resemblant שִׁלְטֵי ('rulers').

ל and ק are very rarely confused, but for נִשְׁקִי in Ps. 78/9 read נָשְׁלוּ s l i p p e d a w a y, which accords the context.

Between ל ang ר, similarity becomes apparent, at some points, only in the later alphabets; there are many instances, however, of confusion between these two letters. In I. Sam. 10/5, 10 instead of imposing on חֶבֶל, in these two cases, the meaning of 'a band' (or 'company') which it bears nowhere else, it is best to conclude that חֶבֶר (see Deut. 18/11; Hos. 6/9 etc.) is the correct reading. In Ps. 9/6, instead of גָּעַרְתָּ גּוֹיִם ('thou hast rebuked nations'), it is better to read גָּעַלְתָּ גֵּאִים ('thou dost reject haughty ones'). Similarly, in Ps. 68/31, בְּעַר should be בְּעַל. In Ps. 7/10, for יִגְמַר ('let it cease'), substitution should be made of יִגְמֹל so that the whole clause may give the sense, 'let the evil of the wicked be requited'; in Jud. 5/5, when it is stated that the mountains 'flowed down' from before the presence of the Lord, it is better to change נָזְלוּ into the resemblant Niphal form נִגְרוּ, and thus make the clause mean that the mountains 'were scattered'; similarly, in Isa. 63/19, and 64/2 נָזֹלוּ should give place to the same form נִגְרוּ; in Lev. 7/19, the concluding term בָּשָׂר ('flesh') should be בָּשֶׁל (or בָּשׁוּל), so that the whole clause may give the sense, 'and the flesh, every clean person shall eat, cooked'; in Ezak. 19/7 the unsuitable form אַלְמְנוֹתָיו ('his widows') must be displaced by the appropriate אַרְמְנוֹתָיו ('his palaces'). In Ex. 2/14, for לְאִישׁ, read רֹאשׁ ('a head', or 'leader'). Ps. 58/7 for כְּפִירִים read כַּבְּלִים double tongued; Isa. 10/2 for וְלִגְזֹל read וּלְנֻזֹר ('and to e x c l u d e').

Though resemblance between ל and ש is hard to perceive in any of the Semitic alphabets, a few passages show that one has occasionally been mistaken for the other. In Ps 55/9, אָחִישָׁה ('I would hasten') has obviously been misread by the Septuagint translator as אוחילה ('I would expect'), as his rendering (προσεδεχόμην) shows; in Hab. 1/4, the closing term מְעֻקָּל should probably rather be מְעֻקָּשׁ ('perverted'). In Ps. 78/31, where the Note-line calls the reader's

attention, the Massoretic Text states that the anger of God 'ascended against the discontented Hebrews; the queried expression עָלָה בָּהֶם should rather be עָשַׁן בָּעָם ('smoked against the people'; see Ps. 74/1; Deut. 29/19).

Confusion between ל and ת has often occurred, despite the absence of resemblance in most alphabets; אל and את, in special, are frequently mistaken, one for the other. Passages in which אל should rather be את are Gen. 49/19, containing Jacob's dying command in Egypt to his children, 'Bury me with my fathers' (μετὰ τῶν πατέρων μου indicating the correct reading in the last clause) Ps. 2/2, where 'decree' should be preceded by the accusatival mark rather than by the preposition; similarly, Jer. 10/2, where the preposition before 'way' should be the accusative-sign; I. Sam. 26/15, where the like correction should be made in the question, 'Wherefore hast thou not kept my Lord the King?'. On the other hand, the preposition should rather be found in Isa. 5/12, containing the expression, 'but to the work of the Lord they do not look'; in Ezek. 24/27 ('thy mouth shall be opened to him who hath escaped'); Jer. 7/22 ('I spake not unto your fathers') etc. In Gen. 49/25, for וְאֵת שַׁדַּי read וְאֵל שַׁדַּי (Sept. ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐμός). In Ex. 5/12, at the close, instead of לַתֶּבֶן, substitute the denominative verb-form לְלָבֵן, so that the clause may give the appropriate meaning 'to gather stubble for making bricks' (see Gen. 11/3; Ex. 5/7,14); in Ps. 22/16, the closing term תִּשְׁפְּתֵנִי, bearing a somewhat indeterminate sense ('thou dost place me') should be set aside in favour of the more definite and appropriate resemblant תַּשְׁפִּילֵנִי, so that the whole clause may signify 'thou dost abase me to the dust of the earth'.

[1] מ or ם.

---

[1] For cases in which מ has been mistaken for נ, see above, under these letters (pp. 15—16).

(m) Unlike as מ (ם) and נ (ן) are in the Modern Hebrew alphabet, they show close resemblance in the older characters, particularly the Phoenician and the Samaritan; substitution must thus have taken place long ago, rather than within recent times. The unique form כָּמֹס in Deut. 32/34 is acknowledged to be a transcriptional error for כָּנֻס ('stored up'). For the opening term וְהִנֵּה ('and behold.'), the Septuagint translator, by his rendering (αὐτοὶ δὲ), shows that he misread this form as וְהֵמָּה ('but they') on the other hand, in Ps. 59/8 and Hab. 2/13, הִנֵּה must be an error for חֵמָה ('wrath'); in Zep. 2/2, the corresponding Greek for כְּמֹץ ('like chaff'), viz. ὡς ἄνθος, proves that the Translator took the form to be כְּנֵץ ('like a flower'); in Jer. 31/1, where the Massoretic text states that the people of Israel found 'grace' in the wilderness, the prosaic Greek interpreter must have read חֵן as חֹם, his rendering being θερμόν ('heat'). In Gen. 23/17, the form וַיָּקָם (rightly queried by a scribe who inserted the Note-line) makes the Massoretic text mean that 'the field of Ephron . . . . rose up to Abraham'; but וַיִּקָּן (converted Niphal imperfect of קָנָה) gives the sense required by the context and by 49/30, viz. 'and the field . . . . was bought by Abraham'; a similar change of letters is required in Lev. 25/30; and Gen. 49/32, an incomplete sentence in its Massoretic form because of the opening term מִקְנֵה (a construct noun), is rectified by changing this form into the verb נִקְנָה, for the verse now runs thus, 'The field, and the cave which was in it, was bought from the children of Heth'. In Ps. 99/1, the unique and irreducible verb-form תָּנוּט changed to תָּמוּט, or תִּמּוֹט, gives the meaning required in the clause, viz. 'let the earth quake'; in Ps. 80/7, the context requires לָמוֹ ('at them') to be changed to לָנוּ ('to us'). In Ps. 89/17, parallelism shows that יָרוּמוּ should be יָרֹנּוּ ('they shall shout'). Ps. 80/7 (end) for לָמוֹ read לָנוּ ('to us').

It is convenient at this point to note the occasional

confusion between the letter מ or ם and its resemblant combinations נו and נ֫י, frequently involving a difference in pronominal suffixes as well as in other directions. In Josh. 5/1, for the Qeri עָבְרָם ('their crossing over') the Kethib is עָבְרֵנוּ ('our crossing over'); in Jer. 31/14, the context requires that the concluding term אֵינֶנּוּ should be אֵינָם ('and they are not'); in Ps. 77/14, for כֵּאלֹהִים ('like God') the Septuagint reading is ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν כֵּאלֹהֵינוּ ('like our God'). Ps. 58/10 יְשַׁעֲרֵנוּ should be יְשַׁעֲרֵם ('shall sweep them away'). In Ps. 12/8, the Massoretic Text presents the expression תִּשְׁמְרֵם תִּצְּרֵנוּ to which an observant scribe has added the Note-line, questioning the correctness of the second word because of the sudden change of the personal suffixes; while the Septuagint rendering, φυλάξεις ἡμᾶς καὶ διατηρήσεις ἡμᾶς, indicates another and smoother reading, viz. תִּשְׁמְרֵנוּ תִּצְּרֵנוּ ('thou shalt keep us, thou shalt preserve us'). Exception may well be taken to the Received Text at the end of Isa. 37/18, where Hezekiah is represented as saying, 'The Kings of Assyria have laid waste all the lands and their land'; but by changing אַרְצָם into אַרְצֵנוּ the difficulty disappears, for the closing term now means 'our land'. Ps. 68/36, as God gives His special gifts, not to all the people but to humble ones לְעָם should rather be לֶעָנִי Isa. 3/13 end for עַמִּים read עֲנָוִים or עֲנִיִּים ('oppressed ones').

Resemblance between the forms of מ (ם) and ס is patent in the more modern alphabets, but hardly visible in the earlier characters, interchange of these letters has thus mostly occurred in later times. Examples of misreading appear in Isa. 30/4, where the unique form חָנֵס, the name of a city in Lower Egypt, is represented in the Septuagint by μάτην, having been regarded as חִנָּם ('in vain'); in I. Kings 20/42 and 21/4, where סַר ('stubborn') should rather be מַר ('bitter'), and similarly in 21/5 the feminine סָרָה should rather be מָרָה; in Hos. 7/14, where יָסוּרוּ ('they turn aside')

is less appropriate than יָמְרוּ ('they are rebellious'); In Jud. 1/35, where, instead of בְּהַר חֶרֶס, the reading in some Manuscripts is בְּהַר חֶרֶם ; in Exod. 23/24, where תָּרֹס תְּהָרְסֵם ('thou shalt utterly break down') should give place to הַחֲרֵימֵם תַּחֲרִימֵם ('thou shalt utterly destroy'); similarly, in Ex. 15/7 ; תַּהֲרֹס should be תַּחֲרִים. Isa. 40/6 for חַסְדּוֹ ('his kindness'), read חֶמְדּוֹ 'his b e a u t y'.

Though similarity of form between מ and ע is found in the Palmyrene characters only, errors of transcription might readily be made in writings executed when that alphabet was in common use, but hardly at any other period. In Lev. 5/8, the context shows that מִמּוּל ('from the front of') should rather be מֵעַל ('from off') ; in Ps. 13/3, the form יָרוּם queried by the scribe who prefixed the Note-line, should be replaced by יָרִיעַ, which will make the whole clause fitly mean 'how long shall mine enemy shout triumphantly over me ?' (cf. Ps. 41/12 ; Jer. 50/15) In Ps. 60/4, the unique verb-form פְּצַמְתָּה ('thou hast rent it') should rather be the more appropriata פְּצַעְתָּה ('thou hast bruised it'). Also, in Isa. 40/9, the s e c o n d הָרִימִי which had been assimilated to the first should rather be הָרִיעִי ('s h o u t').

The resemblance of form, especially in the Palmyrene alphabet, between מ and פ, sufficiently accounts for transcriber's errors in substituting one letter for the other. In Isa. 65/4, for the Kethib וּמְרַק, וּפִרַק is given as the Qeri. In Ps. 71/7, the opening term כְּמוֹפֵת ('like a wonder') is hardly suitable, and should more probably be כְּמוֹ מֵת ('like one dying'), as suggested by Weir ; in Jer. 31/39, the unique form הַשְּׁדֵמוֹת is certainly a transcriptional error, not for הַשְּׂדֵמוֹת ('the cultivated fields') which the Massoretes suggest as the Qeri, but, as the context shows, for הַשְּׂרֵפוֹת ('the burnings', especially of dead bodies, Num. 19/6, or other matter that was to be consumed by fire). In the last clause of II. Kings 13/7, it is stated, according to the Massoretic Text, that

the King of Syria made the oppressed people of Israel 'like dust to thresh' ; but as the verb דוּשׁ is normally employed with reference to the treading out of grain, כֶּעָפָר ('like dust') should rather be כֶּעָמִיר ('like a sheaf of corn'). In Mic. 7/9, זַעַף is wrongly attributed to the Lord, inasmuch as this noun, with its cognate adjective and verb, normally indicates 'ill humour' of man because of disappointment (see II. Chr. 16/10; 28/9 ; Prov. 19/12 ; I. Kings 20/43 etc.) the proper reading is זַעַם, which indicates the 'righteous anger' of God 'see Isa. 26/20; 30/27 ; Nah. 1/6 ; Ps. 38/4; 102/11 etc.).

None but the later forms of מ and צ could easily be mistaken one for the other, and even then only when their distinguishing features were not carefully brought out ; hence the cases in which they have been confused are few. According to the Massoretic text of Ps. 68/32, Ethiopia was to 'hasten' (l i t. 'cause to run') its hands to God ; but as the expression is quite unusual, the verb-form תָּרִיץ should be replaced by תָּרִים ('raiseth') as proposed by Hitzig and Wellhausen. In Jud. 16/3, the Note-line at the verb-form וַיָּקָם ('and he arose') seems to indicate preference of the inserting scribe for the resemblant וַיִּיקַץ ('and he awoke') in the description of Samson as getting up at midnight in Gaza, to carry off the city-gates ; and certainly, in Ps. 78/65, the converse change between these two forms is most desirable, in order that a more becoming predication ('and he arose') may be made of God. In Ps. 78/66, צָרָיו ('his adversaries') may more fitly be displaced in favour of מָרָיו ('his rebellious ones').

More readily than in the case just considered could מ and ק be confused, especially in the later alphabets. In Gen. 18/20, the perplexing construct form זַעֲקַת, which, in connection with the two nouns following, has been held to mean the 'cry' (of distress, for help) a g a i n s t Sodom

and Gomorrah—though, on the analogy of other passages (see Prov. 12/13 ; Ezek. 22/28 ; Job. 16/18 etc.), it would rather mean the cry f r o m Sodom and Gomorrah—is best treated as a mistranscription of זַעֲמָתִי, which makes the whole clause mean 'I am justly wroth[1] with Sodom and Gomorrah'. In Ex. 10/21, the verb-form וְיָמֵשׁ, predication of the intense darkness miraculously brought on Egypt, but difficult to explain satisfactorily, is more appropriately changed to וְיִקַּשׁ (apocopated imperfect of קָשָׁה), which would make the clause signify 'and let the darkness be intense'. In Hab. 1/8 parallelism requires that מֵרָחוֹק should be כְּרָחָם ('like a carrion-vulture'). Ps. 68/28 רִגְמָתָם should be רִגְשָׁתָם ('their crowd'). Ps. 35/3 for הָדֵק read הָרֵם ('lift up').

An imperfectly formed ם may so closely resemble ר, in many alphabets that transcribers might easily mistake one letter for the other ; illustrations, accordingly, are fairly numerous. In Zach. 13/1 where מָקוֹר ('a fountain') occurs, the corresponding term in the Septuagint is τόπος, representing מָקוֹם ('a place') ; in Isa. 33/15, where interpreters have been constrained, on considering the context, to impose on the participle עֹצֵם (whose root-meaning is to be 'strong' or 'numerous') the foreign sense of 'restraining', the proper course is to substitute the resemblant עֹצֵר and thus obtain the rendering required for the clause, 'restraining his eyes (Sept. καμμύων τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς) from seeing evil' ; similarly, in Isa. 29/10, the Piel וַיְעַצֵּם should be וַיְעַצֵּר ('and he hath restrained'). In Ex. 22/5, dealing with compensation to be made by one who set fire to growing corn in the time of harvest, קְצִים ('thorns') should be set aside in favour of the resemblant קָצִיר ('grain-crop'); in Ex. 19/18, הָהָר ('the mountain') must rather be הָעָם ('the people'), for only persons can be said to tremble in fear. Ps. 69/16 for the תֵּאָסַר read תֵּאָטַם ('shut').

---

1) See the explanation given on page 96.

In several of the most ancient alphabets, מ and ש were apt to be confounded when the foot-stalk of the former became indistinct (compare the forms in the Table); in the more modern alphabets, however, the forms show little resemblance; errors in the transcription of these two letters, accordingly, may safely be regarded as of long standing. In Ezek. 47/19, the Septuagint representative of the proper name קָדֵשׁ is Καδήμ, קָדֵם. In Zach. 10/2, the verb-form יְנַחֲמוּן ('they comfort'), which is quite unsuited to the context, should be replaced by the appropriate term יְנַחֲשׁוּ ('they practise sorcery'); in Zach. 2/4, for the impracticable expression כְּפִי אִישׁ, substitute כְּפַר אֵיִם ('like a fierce bull'). In Deut. 21/14, forbidding a husband who divorces his wife, for no good reason, to sell her to another, there occurs the unworkable expression לֹא תִתְעַמֵּר בָּהּ, in which the verb-form, when changed to its resemblant תִתְעַשֵּׁר, gives the appropriate meaning, 'thou shalt not enrich thyself through her'; a similar change of וְהִתְעַמֵּר into וְהִתְעַשֵּׁר must be made in Deut. 24/7. In Ex. 12/44, by changing אִישׁ to אִם, the required introduction of a conditional proposition is secured. Ps. 64/7 for קֶרֶב אִישׁ put קֶבֶר אֵיִם 'an awful grave'.

The later Hebrew alphabets, but not the earlier, show that מ (or ם) and ת might easily be interchanged in consequence of similarity in form. In Jud. 1/7, instead of the impossible reading, 'seventy Kings', at which a Note-line has properly been inserted, 'seven' may be accepted as the correct number; שִׁבְעִים (which further violates the rule in Hebrew grammar for the construction of numerals) must be changed to שִׁבְעַת. In Deut. 4/19, prohibiting worship of the sun, the moon, and the stars, and declaring the divine purpose in appointing them for the convenience of all nations, אֹתָם ('them') should rather be אֹתֹת ('signs'), as indicated in Gen. 1/14; in Num. 14/4, נִתְּנָה ('let us give') is far less appropriate than its resemblant נְמַנֶּה ('let us appoint');

and similarly, in Deut. 16/18, beginning 'Judges and officers shalt thou give to thyself', the verb-form תִּתֶּן is less suitable than the apocopated Piel form תְּמַן ('thou shalt appoint'); similarly, in Ex. 18/24, וַיִּתֵּן should be וַיַּמֵּן ('and he appointed'). In Ps. 92/9, instead of the term מָרוֹם ('height') which must in any case be held as predication of the Lord, it is most probable that the form is a mistranscription of תָּרוֹם ('thou art exalted'); in II. Kings 9/15, for הַמַּכִּים it is necessary to substitute הַמַּכּוֹת ('the wounds'); in Isa. 3/4, the questionable form וְתַעֲלוּלִים may be an error for the more acceptable form וּמְעוֹלְלִים ('and petulant boys'); see verse 12.

(n) נ[1]. The respective forms of ג and ס show little likeness, yet a few instances occur in which one letter has been mistakenly substituted for the other. The very questionable form כַּפִּיס, found only in Hab. 2/11, and alleged to mean 'a rafter', or 'cross-beam', is most probably a corruption of כָּפֶן ('famishing'), and in Hab. 1/9, instead of לְחָמָס ('for violence'), a more suitable form would be בְּהָמוֹן ('in great multitude'). In Jer. 20/8, for וּלְקֶלֶס, it may be better to substitute the more familiar form וּלְקָלוֹן ('and for disgrace').

Between ג and פ there is considerable resemblance, particularly in the more ancient alphabets. The proper name פַּעֲרַי, in II. Sam. 23/35, appears as נַעֲרַי in I. Chr. 11/37. In Jud. 1/11 occurs the name of a well-known town קִרְיַת סֵפֶר, which, in the Massoretic text of Josh. 15/49, has been debased into the form of קִרְיַת סַנָּה, though the Septuagint rendering (πόλις γραμμάτων) points to the correct reading. The very questionable form צִינִים at the opening of Prov. 22/5 is most fitly regarded as a transcriptional error for the participle צֹפֵן, which allows the first clause to be rendered, 'he who hideth snares in the way is depraved'.

---

1) On the resemblance of ג to other letters preceding it in the alphabet, and consequent confusion with them, see under ב, ג, כ, מ.

In Ps. 63/2, the awkward adjective עָיֵף ('weary') should rather be עַיִן, so that the clause in which it stands may mean 'a well without water'.

It is difficult to account for confusion נ and צ, on the score of resemblance to each other, yet some instances seem to prove that one has actually been mistaken for the other. In I. Sam. 1/24, the highly questionable circumstantial clause at the end, וְהַנַּעַר נָעַר, may best be regarded as a mistranscription of וְהַנַּעַר צָעִיר ('the lad being little'). In Jer. 31/11, picturing the return of the Hebrew Exiles to Zion, the verb-form וְנָהֲרוּ ('and they shall flow together') is not so fitting a description of their joy and gladness as the resemblant וְצָהֲלוּ, which, indeed, is previously employed in verse 6, under like circumstances; and in the latter half of Prov. 29/6, the unique and questionable form יָרוֹן (usually held to mean 'sings', or 'shouts') should rather be יָרוּץ ('runs'), following the Targum and some Hebrew MSS.

In nearly all alphabets, נ and ר have some features in common which frequently led transcribers to mistake one of these letters for the other; illustrations are so numerous that only a few can be given here; but beginning may be made by noting the interchange of 'Nebuchadnezzar' (II. Kings 24/1; 25/1 etc.) with 'Nebuchadrezzar' (Jer. 39/1, 11; Ezek. 29/18 etc.), and of נְחוּם in Neh. 7/7, with רְחוּם in Ezra. 2/2. Let it also be noted that the proper name עָנֵר in Gen. 14/24 is represented in the Septuagint by Αὐνάμ, עָנָן in Josh. 7/1 by Ἀχάρ, and דְּבִיר in Josh. 10/3 by Δαβίν. In Prov. 1/11, for the unsuitable term חִנָּם ('without cause') substitute חֵרֶם, which smoothly closes the verse ('let us conceal a net for the guileless one'); at the opening of Ps. 80/16, the unique form וְכַנָּה, after which the querying Note-line has been fitly placed, should be the resemblant וְכֶרֶם ('and the vineyard'). Specially common are cases in which forms from the root נחם have been confused with

these forms רִחַם; thus, in Jer. 20/16, נִחַם ('repented') should rather be רִחַם ('pitied'); in Zach. 8/14, נִחַמְתִּי ('I repented') should be רִחַמְתִּי ('I pitied'); in Ps. 106/45, וַיִּנָּחֵם ('and he repented') is a mistranscription of וַיֵּרַחֵם ('and he showed compassion'). In Prov. 10/7, to make distinct the antithesis between the remembrance of the just and that of the wicked, it is necessary to restore the closing form יִרָקֵב ('shall rot') to its original form יִבָּקֵב ('shall be accursed'). The derivatives of רדף and נדף have been confused in Isa. 17/13, where רְדַף ('is preserved') should be נְדַף ('is driven away' as by the wind); conversely, in Prov. 21/6, נִדַּף ('driven') is represented in the Septuagint by διώκει (i. e. רֹדֵף 'pursueth'). In Josh. 15/18 and Jud. 1/14, many modern interpreters have been mislead by the mistranscribed form וַתִּצְנַח, which they have taken to mean that Achsah 'alighted' from off her ass in order to make the special request from her father Caleb; the Septuagint, however, which shows ἔκραζεν in the first passage and ἐβόησεν or ἀνεβόησεν is וַתִּצְלַח in the second, and points to the correct form, viz. וַתִּצְרַח, which indicates that she did not descend but merely 'shouted'. Ps. 36/12 for תְּנִדֵּנִי read תַּרְדֵּנִי ('subdue'). Isa. 40/9, for לְעָרֵי ('to the cities') read לַעֲנִיֵּי ('to the sad ones') of Judah.

In the more ancient alphabets, the top of נ bears some resemblance to ש; and if its foot-stalk becomes indistinct, one letter is all the more readily mistaken for the other; in actual fact, instances of the confusion present themselves frequently, In Num. 18/8, the inappropriate term מָשְׁחָה ('anointing') should give place to the resemblant מַתָּנָה ('gift'); and similarly the construct form מִשְׁחַת in Lev. 7/35 (twice) is to be set aside in favour of מִנְחַת, which gives excellent sense. In Num. 24/13, where the reference of Balaam's reply is to speech, not action, on his part, לַעֲשׂוֹת ('to do') must be a transcriptional error for לַעֲנוֹת ('to answer'). In Lev. 16/13, the construct form עֲנַן ('cloud') is queried by the Note-line

following, because עָשָׁן ('smoke') is a much more fitting term to use where mention is made of the burning of incense; conversely, in Isa. 6/4, following the proclamation by the seraphim that the whole earth is 'full of the glory' of the Lord it is so strange to read that the Holy Place in the Temple was 'filled with smoke', that עָשָׁן, the term concluding the verse, must surely be regarded as a scribal error for עָנָן ('cloud'); see Ex. 16/10; Lev. 16/2; Num. 10/34 etc. In Ps. 4/3, the opening expression בְּנֵי אִישׁ ('O ye children of men') does not suit the context so well as the resemblant בְּנֵי אָוֶן ('O ye children of vanity'); and in Hab. 3/1, שְׁגְיֹנוֹת ('dithyrambs') must surely be an error for נְגִינוֹת ('stringed instruments'), as at the close of this prophesy (verse 19).

Only in some of the older alphabets do נ and ת approximate in their forms, and then only when the peculiar features of each are not carefully preserved; cases of confusion are comparatively few. In II. Chr. 11/18, the form בן in the Massoretic text is corrected in the margin, into בַּת ('daughters'); in Gen. 23/15, the form שְׁמָעֵנִי ('hear me') has been read as שָׁמַעְתִּי by the Septuagint translator, who has written ἀκήκοα ('I have heard'). In Ps. 52/9, describing the blind trust of the rich man in his wealth, the concluding clause of the Massoretic text, viz. יָעֹז בְּהַוָּתוֹ ('he groweth strong in his wickedness') should more probably be יַעֲלֹז בְּהוֹנוֹ ('he exults in his wealth'), which forms a fitting parallel to the preceding clause ('he trusteth in the abundance of his riches'). In Hab. 2/16, difficulty is felt in conceiving what can be meant by the expression 'the cup of the right hand of the Lord'; but if יָמִין, the noun in the middle, be changed to חֲמַת, the resultant meaning ('the cup of wrath of the Lord') at once commends itself (see Isa. 51/7; Job. 21/20 etc.) In Hos. 10/6, for אוֹתוֹ read אוֹנוֹ ('its wealth').

(o) In the more ancient alphabets, ס and ע are so unlike that they could hardly be mistaken for each other ; but in those used at the Christian Era and later, there appear features of similarity calculated to mislead transcribers. Hence the unique form אֶפַע in Isa. 41/24 must be regarded as a scribal error for אֶפֶס ('nothing'), which frequently occurs in the same book (34/12 ; 40/17 ; 41/12, 29, etc.) in Jud. 5/20, מִמְּסִלּוֹתָם ('from their highways') should more probably be מִמַּעֲלוֹתָם ('from their heights'), inasmuch as the reference is to the stars. For עֲדָנִים in II. Sam. 1/24, substitute סְדִינִים ('undergarments') similarly, in Ps. 62/10, לַעֲלוֹת ('to ascend') should rather be לִסְלוֹת (or better לְהִסָּלוֹת) as the context plainly requires the meaning 'to be weighed' in a balance.

In the Samaritan, the Egyptian—Aramaic, and the Palmyrene alphabets, ס anb פ present points of likeness which might easily lead transcribers to write one of these letters instead of the other. The similarity may be taken as the reason why, in Ps. 89/34, the abnormal and unexpected form אָפִיר ('I will annul') appears rather than such a form as the resemblant אָסִיר ('I will take away'), and conversely, in Ps. 57/2, אֶחֱסֶה ('I will trust') rather than the more probable form אֶחָפֶּה ('I shall be covered') ; also, in Amos. 8/4, הַשּׁוֹאֲפִים ('who pant after') rather than הַשָּׁאסִים[1] ('who plunder').

Except in the Palmyrene characters, points of resemblance between the forms of ע and פ are hard to perceive ; cases in which these two letters have been confused are therefore few. In Zach. 10/2, the closing term רֹעֶה ('shepherd'), is represented in the Septuagint by ἴασις ('healing') must have been regarded by the translator as a derivative of רָפָא ; in Ps. 55/9, the second word in the expression

---

1) On the insertion of א into their form (Qal participle of שָׁסַס), cf. the form in Jer. 30/16.

מְרוּחַ סוּפָה ('generally alleged to mean 'from a rushing wind') occurs only there, and is preferably regarded as a scribal error for סַפָּה (or סוּפָה), which would make the expression signify, 'from a sweeping wind'.

(p) In the modern—not the ancient—alphabets, ע and צ bear a close resemblance, and instances of their exchange[1] are comparatively numerous. In I. Sam. 21/8, the form הָרֹעִים ('the shepherds'), designating the class to which Doeg belonged, is most probably a mistranscription of הָרָצִים ('the runners', or 'the couriers'); in Hos. 13/10, the context shows that the expression בְּכָל עָרֶיךָ ('in all thy cities') should rather be מִכָּל צָרֶיךָ ('from all thine adversaries'); in Job. 4/10, the unique verb-form נִתָּעוּ ('are broken'), predicated of the teeth of young lions, may possibly be a mere Aramaic variation of נִצָּעוּ, which one would expect in normal Hebrew. Ps. 71/3 seems to require a double (converse) substitution; for לְצוּר מָעוֹן read לְעִיר מָצוֹר ('for a fortified city') (cf. Ps. 31/22).

Only in a few later Hebrew alphabets do ע and ק show some resemblance; hence instances of confusion are comparatively rare. The opening term in Ps. 91/8, viz. רַק ('only') should be רַע, and must be restored to the end of verse 7, where it is required as the subject of the last clause, which then runs thus, 'unto thee, no evil shall approach'. The same change must be made in the middle of Ps. 32/6, where the correct reading is בְּעֵת מָצְאוֹ רַע ('in a time when he finds evil'). Conversely, the context of בָּעֵר in Isa. 4/4 seems to require change of this form to בְּקֹרֶת ('though investigation followed by punishment as a corrective'). Isa. 18/4, for אֶשְׁקוֹטָה read אַשְׁקִיעָה ('I shall look forth').

---

[1] The substitution, however, is sometimes due to dialectical peculiarities; thus, the Hebrew ארץ becomes אַרְעָא in Aramaic. See also the quotation above, from Job. 4/10.

Resemblance between the forms of ע and ש (or שׂ) is traceable only in a few of the later Semitic alphabets; hence cases in which these letters have been mistaken, one for the other, can hardly have originated in early times; a fair number of instances occur. When the 'cities of Judah' are represented, in Jer. 26/2, as 'coming'[1] 'to worship' in Jerusalem, the expression עָרֵי יְהוּדָה must surely be an error for שָׂרֵי יְהוּדָה ('the princes of Judah'), a reading actually found later, in verse 10. In Isa. 65/5, the received reading אַל תְּגַּשׁ בִּי presents an abnormal construction of the verb, in being followed by בְּ, instead of the more usual אֶל (Gen. 27/22 etc.), or עַד (Gen. 33/3) or עַל (Ezek. 9/6), with anyone of which the expression would certainly mean, 'Come not near to me', as in most Versions; the correct form of the verb, however, is תִּגַּע, which removes every difficulty by giving the appropriate sense required in the utterance of one who deemed himself so pure as to dread defilement through contact with others, ('touch me not, for I am holier than thou'); in Job. 41/9, similarly, יִגָּשׁוּ should be יִגָּעוּ ('they touch'). In II. Sam. 24/13, 'seven' years of famine is an obvious transcriptional error for 'three',—this number being correctly preserved in later clauses of the verse; שָׁלֹשׁ, instead of שֶׁבַע, is attested by the Septuagint (τρία) and by the parallel passage in I. Chr. 24/12; similarly, in Jud. 14/17, 'seven' should be 'three', the number of days remaining out of the seven during which the feast ot Samson's wedding continued. In Ps. 61/8, for עוֹלָם read בְּשָׁלוֹם ('in peace').

Between the forms of ע and ת there is, confessedly, no resemblance in the more ancient alphabets, and little in the more modern; instances of confusion nevertheless occur. In Ps. 78/31, as Grätz suggests, the closing term הִכְרִיעַ ('he

---

1) It is to be noted that the attributive participle is masculine, while its noun is feminine.

laid low') is too mild for a sentence in which the idea of slaughter is dominant, and should rather be the resemblant הִכְרִית ('he cut off'). In Isa. 51/16, occurs the strange expression לִנְטֹעַ שָׁמַיִם ('to plant (as a tree, Lev. 19/23; Deut. 6/11 etc.) the heavens'); but the infinitive here must be a transcriptional error for לִנְטֹת ('to stretch out'); see confirmatory expression in verse 13; 42/22; 45/24; Ps. 104/21 etc. In Num. 9/16 the expression תָּמִיד הֶעָנָן ('always, the cloud') should be עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן ('the pillar of cloud'), as in Ex. 13/22; 14/19; 33/9 etc. In Amos 4/8, as 'cities' cannot wander about, searching, עָרִים should rather be תָּרִים ('explorers'). In Ps. 17/13, for the impossible expression מֵרָשָׁע חַרְבֶּךָ, read מֵרֶשֶׁת חֶרְמֶם ('from their net of utter destruction'). Ps. 79/11 'according to the greatness of thy power' is not a suitable expression; read בְּגֹדֶל זְרֹעֲךָ 'in the great extent of thy s c a t t e r i n g'.

(q) [1] פ. Though the forms of פ and צ show little resemblance to each other, a few cases of confusion occur. In Zach. 11/16, the feminine participle הַנִּצָּבָה, used as a collective, presents a meaning ('those that are standing') unsuited to the context, which mentions feeding; but if הָרְעֵבָה ('those that are hungry') be substituted, a smooth and acceptable reading is secured. In Zach. 1/8, the unique noun-form מְצֻלָה (conjectured to mean 'a shady spot', or 'a hollow') must be regarded as a scribal error for מַפָּלָה or מַפֵּלָה 'ruins'; (see Isa. 17/1; 23/13), which quite suits the context; and in Isa. 58/11, the expression עַצְמֹתֶיךָ יַחֲלִיץ ('thy bones will he invigorate') should rather be עָצְמָתְךָ יַחֲלִיף ('thy strength will he renew'); (cf. a similar expression in Isa. 40/31 and 41/1).

In the later alphabets, but not in the earlier, some

---

1) On confusion of פ with ב, כ, and מ, see what has already been shown, on pages 46, 82, 95.

points of resemblance between פ and ק appear; instances of confusion are thus comparatively rare. In Num. 18/21; 31, the form חֵלֶף (usually viewed as a construct noun signifying 'in return for') should rather be חֵלֶק 'portion', as shown by what is stated in verse 20; in I. Sam. 21/7, where mention is made of the removal, once a week, of the twelve sacred loaves from the table of shew-bread, the expression בְּיוֹם הֻלְקְחוֹ ('in the day (when) it was taken') should rather be בְּיוֹם חֻלִיפָתוֹ ('in the day of its exchange'); in Num. 16/34, describing the panic of those who witnessed the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, there occurs the expression נָסוּ לְקוֹלָם ('they fled at their voice'), but the second term should give place to לִפְלָט, so that the resultant sense may be 'they fled, to escape'.

In all the alphabets, פ and ר present features in common which tend to confusion of these two letters; instances of confusion are thus fairly common. In Jer. 49/7, the verb-form in the expression נִסְרְחָה חָכְמָתָם is unique, and gives no intelligible meaning suited to the context; but by substituting נִסְפְּחָה, there is obtained the sense, in harmony with the preceding context, 'their wisdom hath perished' (lit. 'hath been swept away'). In Ex. 23/3, the verb-form תֶּהְדַּר, fairly interpreted, cannot but determine the sense of the whole verse to be, 'And one reduced in means, thou shalt not honour in his cause'; the difficulty, however, is solved by restoring the resemblant תֶּהְדָּף, and thus obtaining the rendering, 'And one reduced in means thou shalt not thrust aside in his cause'. In Ps. 18/22 and its parallel II. Sam. 22/22, after the opening clause, 'I have kept the ways of the Lord', a more simple and suitable parallel in the latter part than appears in the Received Text, וְלֹא רָשַׁעְתִּי מֵאֱלֹהָי (which must be amplified to give the sense 'neither have I done wrong (in departing) from my God') is obtained by changing the verb-form to the less common פָּשַׁעְתִּי, and

thus securing the meaning, 'neither have I stepped from my God'. In Ps. 41/4, for the questionable verb-form הָפַכְתָּ ('thou didst turn over'), read הֵרִכְתָּ ('thou didst soften'). Ps. 81/17, rock צוּר of honey is less conceivable than 'overflow of honey', hence, read מְצוּף.

As פ and ש show little resemblance in any of the alphabets, confusion of these letters is hardly to be expected ; a few cases, however, do occur. In Job. 14/10, the statement that 'a strong man dieth and groweth weak' cannot be accepted, inasmuch as the feebleness precedes rather than follows death ; but by changing the second verb-form וַיֶּחֱלַשׁ into its resemblant וַיַּחֲלֹף, an unexceptionable sentence is abtained,—'a strong man dieth and passeth away' (cf. Job. 9/26 ; Cant. 2/11 etc.) In Amos. 8/8, besides other corrections to be made, the passive verb-form וְנִגְרְשָׁה ('and shall be driven out') should rather be the resemblant active form וְגָרְפָה ('and shall sweep away'). In Ex. 5/9, וְיַעֲשׂוּ should rather be וְיָעֲפוּ ('that they may become wearied'). In Ps. 30/3, וַתִּרְפָּאֵנִי ('and thou hast healed me') should be וַתְּנַשְּׂאֵנִי ('and thou didst lift me high').

As in the case immediately preceding, פ and ת do not present many points of likeness inducing confusion, yet some instances of substitution do occur. Thus, in the middle of Ps. 64/6, describing how the wicked plot against the righteous, the Massoretic Text simply rendered, means, 'they relate to conceal snares' ; but by regarding the main verb, יְסַפְּרוּ, as a mistranscription of יִסְתְּרוּ, a suitable sense is secured ; 'they hide themselves (at a distance) to conceal snares'. In Ps. 56/9, for סָפַרְתָּ read סָתַרְתָּה, so that the meaning of the clause may become 'my flight thou didst conceal' ; cf. the parallel expression in Isa. 16/3. In Ps. 108/2, the monosyllabic אַף forms a disturbing factor ; but if it be changed to the accusatival sign אֶת, a smoother reading is obtained ('I will hymn my glory') (cf. Ps. 66/2 ; 68/5, 33).

The forms of צ and ק exhibit some resemblance, especially in the Egyptian-Aramaic characters, so that several instances of confusion have obviously occurred. Thus, in Obad. 14, as Grätz has pointed out, הַפֶּרֶק (usually alleged to mean here 'the cross roads', or 'the parting of the ways') the correct reading rather is הַפֶּרֶץ ('the breach' (in the city-wall)). In Jer. 37/12, according to the Massoretic text, the prophet endeavoured to leave Jerusalem when the close siege of Jerusalem had been relaxed; the unique Hiphil infinitive לַחֲלִיק represents him as going forth 'to take (his) portion thence', but we must rather read the resemblant form לַחֲלֹק, and thus secure the appropriate statement that he went out of the city 'to withdraw from it' (cf. Hos. 5/6). In Ps. 58/7, the form נְתוֹץ, fitly marked by a querying Note-line, is the Qal imperative of a verb normally used elsewhere to signify not the breaking of teeth but the breaking down of buildings (see Ex. 34/13; Lev. 14/45; Deut. 7/5; Jud. 6/30, 31, 32 etc.); it should rather be נְתוֹק, elsewhere seen to mean 'break', 'pluck out', or 'draw out', 'turn out'. (Jud. 8/16; 16/9, 12; Ezek. 17/9; Ps. 2/3; 107/143; Jer. 6/29 etc.) Isa. 10/14, for כְּקֵן read כְּנֵץ ('like the hawk). In Zach. 14/20, the perplexing expression עַל מְצִלּוֹת הַסּוּס should be עַל מַקְלוֹת הַסּוֹךְ ('all the rough rods of the booth' erected at the Feast of Tabernacles)[1]. Ps. 68/17, presenting the inappropriate verb-form תִּרְצְדוּן rightly inserted with the Note-line should instead have תִּרְקְדוּ ('Ye leap').

(r) ע[2]. Between צ and ר, there is little resemblance in any of the alphabets,—in the Samaritan, none at all. Nevertheless transcribers have sometimes confused the two; in Jer. 4/26, describing the utter desolation, in fertile ground, following on the displeasure of the Lord, it is out of place

---

1) See the Writer's treatise on Zachariah.

2) On the resemblance between ע and צ, see page 104.

to read, as in the Massoretic text עָרָיו נִתְּצוּ ('its cities were broken down'); the correct reading must rather be עֵצָיו נִתְּצוּ ('its trees were consumed by fire'). In Deut. 7/19, instead of הוֹצִיאֲךָ ('he brought thee out'), which necessitates a forced construction of the whole clause, it is better to read הֶרְאֲךָ ('he showed thee'), which smooths the course of the address.

צ and שׁ confused rarely,—Isa. 10/12; as מַעֲשֵׂהוּ for openly signifies work d o n e, it seems better here to read מַעֲצֵהוּ 'his purpose (plan)'. Ps. 68/15 for בְּפָרֵשׂ read בְּפָרֵץ ('when the Almighty scattered things') Ps. 73/19 for צַלְמָם read שַׁלְמָם ('their prosperity').

(s) The forms of ק and ר, in many of the Semitic alphabets, present some features in common which naturally lead a scribe, copying from a previous manuscript not written with due care, to mistake one letter for the other. In Zach. 11/2, as the statement in the Massoretic text that 'the forest hath come down' (from Lebanon) cannot be regarded as correct, יָרַד should give place to יֻקַּד ('is set on fire'). In Jud. 7/21, describing the panic of the Midianite and Amalekites, suddenly alarmed through the night by the stratagem of Gideon and his men, Moore ingeniously and fitly suggests that וַיָּרָץ should be changed to וַיִּיקַץ, and the clause thus made to mean 'and all the camp awoke',—not 'ran', for it is to be observed that flight is (naturally) mentioned afterwards. In Joel 2/2, it is difficult to accept שַׁחַר as the correct reading, which makes the prophet compare the darkening swarms of locusts to 'dawn' spread upon the mountains; the form should more probably be שַׁחַק, which gives the preferable comparison, 'like a fine cloud' (or 'mist'); see Isa. 45/8; Jer. 51/9; Ps. 36/6 etc. In Mic. 1/3 instead of מִמְּקוֹמוֹ ('from his place') which is rather prosaic, it may be well to substitute מִמְּרוֹמוֹ ('from his height') (as the next clause states that the Lord 'descends'). In Num. 22/15, the form וְהִתְפָּרְדוּ makes the Psalmist declare that his bones

were 'separated' one from the other ; substitution of וְהִתְפַּקְדוּ, however, would more appropriately mean that they could be 'numbered' (see Num. 1/47 ; 2/33 ; 26/62 Jud. 20/15, 17 ; 21/9 ; I. Kings 20/27). In Ps. 60/3, וַיָּקֶם should rather be וַיָּרֶם the context requires a word that signifies to raise (or elevate) not merely to cause to stand up. Ps. 69/27 ; the closing term יְסַפְּרוּ ('they talk') is too mild in meaning and ought surely to be יִסְפְּקוּ ('they clap (their hands)').

(t) ר[1]. Though nothing but the top of ר can be regarded as bearing any resemblance to ש, and this even in the later alphabets, there are unmistakeable instances in which one of these letters has been substituted for the other. In Jud. 14/15, the context shows that the expression 'on the seventh day' ought rather to be 'on the fourth day' (of Samson's marriage feast), i. e. that הַשְּׁבִיעִי is a transcriptional error for הָרְבִיעִי, as furthermore indicated by ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα τῇ τετάρτη in the Septuagint. In Deut. 1/22, mentioning the dispatch of spies to search out the land of Canaan, the form וְיַחְפְּרוּ ('that they may dig') out rather to be וְיַחְפְּשׂוּ ('that they may search through') ; other passages in which, contrary to some lexical authorities, forms from חפר should be transferred to חפש, Josh. 2/2, 3 ; Job. 39/29. Jer. 21/12, according to the Massoretic text and the English Versions, contains the divine command, 'execute judgment in the morning' ; but it seems better to change לַבֹּקֶר into the resemblant participle מְבַקֵּשׁ, and thus obtain the sentence, 'vindicate the cause of him who seeketh judgment', which forms a fitting parallel to the clause following.

ר and ש interchanged ; Ps. 103/9, for יִטֹּר read יִטֹּשׁ ('forsake'). Isa. 3/7 for חֹבֵשׁ read חַבָּר ('an associate, partner'). In Ps. 46/3, the meaning of verb-form בְּהָמִיר ('change', or

---

1) On confusion between ר and ב, ד, ה, כ, ל, נ, see above, pages.

'exchange') does not suit the context; but בְּהָמִישׁ gives the sense required ('move away', or 'depart'); see Ex. 33/11; Josh. 1/8; Jud. 6/18; Zach. 14/4; Prov. 17/13 etc. In Isa. 4/5 וּבָרָא seems less suitable than such a form as the resemblant וְנִשָּׂא ('and the Lord shall raise').

Between the forms of ר and ש there is hardly any resemblant traceable except in the Palmyrene characters, and even these do not show much similarity; nevertheless some cases occur in which interchange seems to have taken place. Thus, in Ps. 103/9, the closing form יִשׁוֹר ('and he shall keep') requires a supplementary accusative such as 'anger' to complete the sentence, whereas there would not be such necessity if the form were יִטֹּשׁ ('forsake'); cognate instances appear also in Jer. 3/5, 12.

ק and ת confounded, Ps. 36/8; for יָקָר read יִתֵּר superabundant.

In the case of ר and ת, the right side of the latter is obviously identical in form with the former, in the modern alphabet, though not in the older characters; hence, dimness or accidental disappearance of the left side of ת would naturally lead many a scribe to mistake such a form for the other letter. Instances of the confusion appear in Gen. 36/40 (end), where the proper name יֶתֶק, is represented by Ἰετερ in the Septuagint; in I. Kings 1/11, where the proper name בַּת שֶׁבַע is given in the Septuagint as Βηρσαβεε (Cod. B. and Lucian, though Cod. A. has Βηθσαβεε); in Ps. 31/22, where בְּעִיר מָצוֹר ('in a strong city') should rather be בְּעֵת מָצוֹק ('in a time of distress'); as suggested by Wellhausen; in Ps. 10/3, where the inappropriate form בֵּרַךְ ('blesseth') should be בְּתֹךְ ('through oppression'); in Jer. 22/17 (end), where the unsuitable form לַעֲשֹׂת ('to do') should give place to לַעֲשֵׁר ('to grow rich'). In Ps. 19/3 אֹמֶר which always conveys the idea of 'speech', is in flat contradiction to what is stated in the next verse; but substitution of אֵמֶת gives more suitable

sense ('truth') ('truthfulness'), and a better correlative to דַּעַת in the second half of the verse.

NOTE ON FINAL FORMS OF SOME LETTERS.

Before concluding these remarks on the interchange of similar forms in the Hebrew alphabets, it is of importance to note that the finals (ך, ם, ן, ף, ץ, used at the end of words, instead of כ, מ, נ, פ, צ) are of comparatively late origin. Only when this is borne in mind can one readily understand how, in earlier times, before the introduction of these forms, it was easy for the Septuagint translator of I. Sam. 1/1 to render what now appears as בֶּן־צוּף ('son of Zuph') by ἐν Νασιβ (i. e. בְּנָצִיב); or in 20/40 to represent לֵךְ הָבִיא ('go, bring') by πορεύου, εἴσελθε (i. e. לְכָה בּוֹא, 'go, enter'); or that a Hebrew transcriber, at 15/18, should write כַּלּוֹתָם instead of כַּלּוֹתְךָ, which is attested by the Septuagint, the Peshito, and the Targum. Other illustrations appear in Ps. 22/30, where the unsuitable form אָכְלוּ ('they have eaten') is a mistranscription of וְלוֹ אַף ('but to him'); in Ps. 10/9, where the opening יֶאֱרֹב ('he lieth in wait') should be יֶאֱרַךְ ('he waiteth long').

7. SUBSTITUTION OF MORE THAN ONE SIMILAR LETTER.

A more extensive view may now be taken, to consider cases in which more than one letter in a word has been erroneously substituted for the resemblant originals. In Zach. 10/6, the opening clause, 'and I will strengthen the house of Judah', presents an idea hardly suited to the context; but if the verb-form וְגִבַּרְתִּי (which is marked with the Note-line as questionable) be changed to וְזָכַרְתִּי ('and I will remember'), a fitting meaning is secured. In Deut. 7/16, the opening verb-form וְאָכַלְתָּ ('and thou shalt eat') is quite

unsuitable, and must be exchanged for וְאִבַּדְתָּ ('and thou shalt destroy'), which doubtless was the original reading. Isa. 1/28 presents a somewhat strange expression, 'Zion shall be redeemed with justice' ; but by assuming that the verb-form תִּפָּדֶה is an error of transcription for תִּפְרַח ('shall flourish'), there is obtained a meaning in harmony with the rest of the verse. In Ex. 18/2,—where we read, according to the Massoretic text, that the father-in-law of Moses brought to him his wife Zipporah, 'after the divorce', of which no mention is made elsewhere—for the surprising expression אַחַר שִׁלּוּחֶיהָ, substitute אֶת שִׁפְחָה, which gives the appropriate meaning 'together with an handmaid'. In Lev. 5/15, 16, which prescribes the reparation to be made by one who was guilty of purloining from the sanctuary, the verb-forms וְחָטְאָה ('and sinneth', verse 15) and חָטָא (verse 16) should be וְהוֹצִיאָה ('and carry out') and הוֹצִיא respectively. In Ps. 58/3, for בָּאָרֶץ ('in the land') which gives too mild a meaning to be suitable, substitution shuold be made of the resemblance כְּעָרִיץ ('like a cruel tyrant'). In Gen. 31/40, forming part of Jacob's description of his hardships in the service of Laban, the opening verb-form הָיִיתִי ('I was') fails to commend itself as fitted to the context; but if חָרוֹתִי (form חָרַר ; cf. Isa. 24/6) be substituted, the meaning obtained for the clause ('I was scorched through the day') at once approves itself. In Joel. 2/23, containing the divine promise of the 'former rain', there is difficulty in accepting, as genuine, the term indicating how this would be sent, viz. לִצְדָקָה (lit. 'for righteousness'), which some interpreters take to mean 'in due measure' ; but by substituting the resemblant לַזּוּרְעָה ('for that which has been sown'), hesitation disappears. The prophecy in Isa. 11/11 that the Lord would again put forth his hand to restore the remnant of his people, shows a Note-line prefixed to שֵׁנִית ('and a second time') indicating that the scribe who inserted it deemed this term superfluous,

and further perceived the want, at this point, of a complementary infinitive to follow יוֹסִיף (as in Gen. 8/10, 21 ; Deut. 3/26 ; I. Sam. 27/1, etc.) ; Delitzsch, indeed, pointed out that לִשְׁלֹחַ would supply what is required, but the difficulty is more simply solved by regarding שֵׁנִית as a mistranscription of שָׁלוֹחַ ('to put forth'). In Isa. 43/22, אֹתִי must have been read by the Greek translator as עַתָּה ('now') sèeing that his rendering is νῦν. Conversely, in Isa. 28/22, וְעַתָּה was read as וְאַתֶּם ('but ye'), for which the Greek equivalent is καὶ ὑμεῖς. In Ps. 8/6, for מֵאֱלֹהִים ('than god') the Greek Version (quoted in Heb. 2/7) exhibits παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους, representing מִמַּלְאָכִים ('than angels'). In Ex. 18/23, as Grätz has acutely observed, וְצִוְּךָ ('and he shall command thee') should rather be וְאִמְּצְךָ ('and he shall strengthen thee'). Gen. 42/21, presents אֲבָל ('nevertheless') where אָכֵן ('Verily') would be more appropriate ; the same remark holds in I. Kings 1/43 ; II. Kings 4/14 etc. ; the converse holds in Ps. 31/23 ; 82/7 ; Zeph. 3/7. In Ps. 47/4, for גְּאוֹן ('pride'), נְאוֹת ('habitations') may be a more appropriate reading (see Lam. 2/2). Ps. 25/9, for דַּרְכּוֹ, put דְּבָרוֹ.

A sufficient reason for substitution of similars, involving change of an intelligible reading to another less appropriate was *the damaged condition of the Manuscript from which the copy was made.* If this pattern had become worn through frequent use, or if the material had been affected by damp or otherwise, the writing inevitably became more or less indistinct, so that the transcriber of the new copy would have more or less difficulty in deciding what he should write. Sometimes we are able to recover the correct reading, through patient study of the context. A few illustration of deterioration, presumably belonging to such a class, may be given.

At the beginning of Ps. 44/3, in the remarkable expression אַתָּה יָדְךָ ('Thou, thy hand'), the second word of

which, queried by the inserted Note-line, instead of being regarded as an instrumental accusative (meaning, 'by thy hand') should rather be viewed as the remains of לְבַדְךָ ; the combination will then mean, 'Thou alone' (cf. the thought expressed in verse 4). In the middle of Jer. 41/9, the disturbing expression בְּיַד גְּדַלְיָהוּ ('by the hand of Gedaliah') must be changed to בּוֹר גָּדוֹל הוּא ('it was a vast pit') as shown by the Septuagint (φρέαρ μέγα τοῦτο). In Isa. 21/14, several terms, mostly indicating weapons of war, have been misread by a transcriber, so that the sense has been somewhat obscured ; by rewriting חֲרָבוֹת as חֲנִיתוֹת, and נְטוּשָׁה as לְטוּשָׁה, כִּידוֹן as כֹּבֶד, the verse, which describes the flight of fugitives, assumes the following form ; 'they fled from spears, from a sharpened sword, from a bent bow, from a javelin of war'. In Ps. 89/51, after the first half, which requires merely the change of the plural form עֲבָדֶיךָ into the singular עַבְדְךָ ('thy servant'), there follows in the Massoretic text a series of words שְׂאתִי בְחֵיקִי כָּל רַבִּים עַמִּים, which has been held to mean 'my bearing in my bosom all many peoples', but by assuming that the original text was נָשָׂאתִי בְחֵיקִי כְּלִימַת רַבִּים עַמְּדִי, the course of thought becomes clearer ('I have borne in my bosom the insolence of those who contend with me'). The opening form in the perplexing reading יְשִׁימֻוֶת עָלֵימוֹ at the beginning of Ps. 55/16 has by some been read as יְשִׁימוֹת (to make the expression mean 'Desolations upon them') ; but the Massoretes resolve it into two words יְשֵׁיא מָוֶת (which, with the succeeding term might be held to mean ('Let death deceive (and rush) on them') ; if the opening verb-form was originally יִשְׁאַף, the meaning would be ('Let death pant after them'). The verb-form וַיִּקַּח at the beginning of Num. 16 is perplexing, through want of an object (which some have supposed to be 'men', thus ; 'Now Korah . . . and Dathan and Abiram . . . took (men), and rose up before Moses . . . ') ; but if the troublesome term be originally

וַיָּקָהֲלוּ, difficulty disappears, as the meaning becomes, 'Now Korah, and Dathan and Abiram . . . assembled, and, rose up before Moses'). At the beginning of Isa. 5/9, the unsuitable form בְּאָזְנַי ('In mine ears') should be changed to כֹּה אָמַר ('Thus saith') ; and further on, the inappropriate predication regarding houses which were to become ruins, as גְּדוֹלִים וְטוֹבִים ('large and good') must be regarded as having originally been גַּלִּים וְתִלִּים ('heaps of stones, and rubbish mounds'). In Zach. 12/6, the last two words in the Massoretic Text, viz. תַּחְתֶּיהָ בִּירוּשָׁלָם are incomprehensible, and must surely be a mistranscription of אַחֲרִיתָהּ כָּרִאשׁוֹנָה ('her latter end (shall be) like the first'). At the end of Jud. 20/33, the strange expression מִמַּעֲרֵה גָּבַע (alleged to mean 'out of the meadow of Geba') is most probably a deformed reading of מִמַּעַל לַגִּבְעָה ('above the hill'). In the hands of the wicked men described in Ps. 26/10, there was said to be 'wickedness', but זִמָּה, which is found in the received Hebrew Text, is probably a mistranscription of רֹמַח ('a spear'). Obviously inappropriate is the answer, recorded in Zach. 13/6 by the Massoretes, of the prophet rejected and smitten by his friends, when he was asked regarding the wounds he had received ; as הֻכֵּיתִי בֵּית מְאַהֲבָי means ('I have smitten the house of my friends'), such an answer may well be regarded as irrelevant, and indeed the opposite of what might be expected ; and there is good reason for concluding that the original may rather have been מַכּוֹתַי בְּיַד מְאַהֲבָי ('my wounds at the hand of my friends'). In Amos. 1/1 the words 'concerning Israel' were read by the Septuagint Translator as, 'concerning Jerusalem'. In Isa. 2/4, a more appropriate expression than לְעַמִּים רַבִּים ('many peoples') seems to be לְאֻמִּים רַבִּים ('contending Gentile Nations').

Specially interesting and instructive are cases in which a term of compartively rare occurrence has evidently not been understood by a tran-

scriber, who has there substituted a resemblant form in common use but often unsuited to the context; such substitutions, more or less perplexing, are abundant in Jeremiah. Gen. 41/15 states Joseph's reason for giving the name 'Manasseh' to his eldest son; according to the Massoretic Text, his words run thus, 'God hath made me forget all my toil and all my father's house', but as he did not forget his father's house, one is constrained to conclude that a copyist has inconsiderately substituted בֵּית אֲבִי for the appropriate but less familiar form כְּאֲבִי ('my pain'). In. Ps. 82/3, דַּל ('impoverished') should rather be the rarer form דַּךְ ('crushed') which it is fitly retained in the next verse. In Ex. 21/35, direction is given regarding the recompence to be made when the ox of one man attacked that of another and killed it; the verb-form in the Massoretic Text indicating the kind of attack is the familiar יִגֹּף, meaning 'smites'; a much more appropriate term, however, is the rarer resemblant יִגַּח 'gores' (or 'smites with horns'), which is attested by the Septuagint (κερατίση) and the Peshito. In Lev. 11/37, 38 is the enactment that though seed for sowing, if dry, was not to be regarded as defiled through contact with a dead body, wet seed was to be treated as unclean; the expression in the Received Hebrew Text in the latter cases is כִּי יִתַּן מַיִם עַל זֶרַע, but as the meanig of the verb-form here is very general (l i t. 'given'), it awakens suspicion regarding its correctness, and induces the belief that the original was the rarer resemblant יִנָּתֵךְ, so that the meaning of the whole clause is rather 'if water is poured upon seed'. In Num. 14/17, part of Moses' intercessory prayer to the Lord on behalf of wayward and rebellious Israel, the Received Hebrew Text represents the Great Leader as saying, 'let the power of my Lord be great, according as Thou hast spoken, saying, 'The Lord is long suffering and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression...';

obviously, however, it is not a display of divine power that is sought, but rather a manifestation of more long-suffering; hence כֹּחַ must surely have been mistranscribed for the resemblant חֵן ('grace', or 'favour'). In Deut. 4/31, after it has been declared to Israel, 'the Lord thy God is a compassionate God; He will not desert thee', we certainly do not expect, in the clause immediately following, such a statement as 'neither will He destroy thee', especially because the next clause adds, 'neither will He forget the covenant of thy Fathers'; but if it be assumed that the objectionable term יַשְׁחִיתֶךָּ ('He will not destroy thee') is a mistranscription of יִשְׁמְטֶךָּ ('He will not drop thee'), from a verb somewhat rarely used, the whole verse runs smoothly.

After the heavenly messenger had told Manoah's wife that she should bear a son destined to deliver his fellow-Israelites from the Philistines, and Manoah himself had obtained his request for a similar visit, he is represented in the Massoretic Text (Jud. 13/12) as saying to the Messenger, עַתָּה יָבֹא דְבָרֶיךָ ('now let thy words come'); the verb-form here is highly questionable, however, both because it is singular, while its subject, immediately following, is plural, and because of its meaning ('enter'), or ('come'), n o t ('come to pass', as in some Versions); most probably the true reading is בָּאֵר the Piel imperative of a somewhat rare verb (Deut. 1/5; 27/8 etc.), 'explain', or 'state distinctly',—for such is the spirit of Manoah's request. Though we read in the Received Hebrew Text of Ruth 3/11 that Boaz encouragingly said to Ruth, 'all the gate of my people knoweth that thou art a worthy woman', there can be little doubt that the perplexing term שַׁעַר ('gate') has been mistakenly substituted for the rarer form שְׁאֵר (l i t. 'flesh', i. e. 'blood relations'; see Lev. 18/12; 20/19; Num. 27/11).

So many weak substitutions appear in the Books of

Samuel[1] that only a few can be cited. The confident and encouraging words of David to Saul, when every Israelite but the stripling trembled before Goliath, are given by the Massoretes in a questionable form (I. Sam. 17/32), אַל־יִפֹּל לֵב אָדָם 'Let no man's heart fail', which should rather be אַל יָפֹג לֵב אֲדֹנִי 'Let not the heart of my Lord grow cold'. Similarly, when it is stated in I. Sam. 25/37 regarding Nabal, that on learning from his wife Abigail of the danger in which he had placed himself, through his rude treatment of David, 'his heart died within him', it is highly probable that וַיָּמָת has been miswritten for the rarer form וַיִּמַּס, which would more fitly give the meaning 'and his heart melted within him' (see Josh. 2/11 ; 5/1 ; 7/5 ; Nah. 2/11 etc.). In the tactful address of the wise woman of Tekoa to David, the first word, כִּי ('because') in II. Sam. 14/16, should rather be לוּ, which will fitly represent her as uttering a wish ('O that the King would hear') ; the same substitution is required in Ruth 1/12 ; Ex. 9/14 (beginning).

In the Massoretic Text of Solomon's words to guilty Shimei, I. Kings. 2/44, 'thou knowest all the wickedness that thine heart knoweth', the manifest repetition of the same verb raises suspicion that something is wrong ; but the difficulty is removed if יָדַע, the second verb, be regarded as a mistranscription of יִרְעֶה ; when this form is restored, the sense becomes 'thou knowest all the wickedess in which thine heart delighteth'. In II. Kings 13/7, where the Received Hebrew Text states that the King of Syria treated the subjects of Jehoahaz 'like the dust for threshing', there need be little doubt that כֶּעָפָר has been miswritten for כְּעֶמִיר 'like corn-stalks'.

---

1) After Wellhausen (in 1871) and Klostermann (in 1887) had published important works on the Text of the Books of Samuel, Driver (in 1889) second edition, 1913 and H. P. Smith (Int. Crit. Com. 1899) made further advance.

In Jer. 7/4, the opening clause, 'Trust not to yourselves for lying words', does not commend itself as harmonising in sense or construction with what follows; but by correcting תִּבְטְחוּ into the rarer form תִּבְטְאוּ, and changing—אֶל to אֶת, an appropriate meaning is secured; 'Babble not lying words to yourselves'. In Jer. 8/10, the last clause, to say the least, forms an awkward expression ('he is wholly engaged in committing falsehood'); but if כֻּלֹּה עֹשֶׂה שֶׁקֶר be regarded as a corruption of כֻּלָּם עֹשְׁקֵי הַשָּׂכִיר 'all of them are oppressors of the hireling', a more appropriate thought is obtained. In Jer. 11/19, the closing term in the strange expression, 'let us destroy the tree with its bread', viz. בְּלַחְמוֹ, is doubtless a corruption, by an unintelligent copyist, of a rarer form, בְּלֵיחוֹ 'in its freshness'. In Ps. 19/5, the expression יָצָא קַוָּם ('their line has gone forth'), rightly questioned by the insertor of the Note-line, should rather be the resemblant pair of rarer terms יָצַח לִקְחָם ('their teaching is clear'). In Isa. 2/19, the opening term וּבָאוּ ('And they shall go') is too general and weak to suit the context, and should rather be יֵחָבְאוּ ('they shall hide themselves') similar changes to the same root are required in verses 10 and 21. In Ps. 33/10 a d o u b l e error has been committed גּוֹיִם and עַמִּים should be גֵּאִים and עֲרֻמִּים 'haughty and crafty'.

8. TRANSPOSITION OF LETTERS IN TRANSCRIPTION.

(a) I n t e r n a l metathesis of Letters (anagrams).

A somewhat common error consists in the simple transposition of letters composing a word; the different form thus assumed nearly always[1] changes the sense, and

[1] Not always; for שְׂמָלָה (Gen. 9/23; Deut. 10/18; 22/5 etc.) and שַׂלְמָה (Ex. 22/8; Mic. 2/8) both equally signify the large outer garment worn by the Jews.

sometimes even becomes impracticable. All attempts to determine the point at which these errors have originated, and to fix the blame on the proper person, are vain. The fault may be due to mispronunciation by one who read from the pattern manuscript to the transcriber, who then wrote down what he had heard; or the error may be due to the transcriber alone, who mistook what he had read, and then fixed in the copy he was making the deviation from the original. It is enough for us to recognise that a misleading deviation has been made and demands rectification.

In Ezek. 42/16, the unworkable form אמות is marked by the Massoretes as a mistranscription of מֵאוֹת ('hundreds') but the same correction must be made in 40/5; in II Sam. 20/14 also, וַיִּקָּהֲלוּ is noted as an error for וַיִּקָּהֲלוּ ('and they were gathered together'); and similarly, in I. Kings 7/45, the Kethib האהל should de הָאֵלֶּה ('these'). Many such errors, however, have been left uncorrected—probably may not have been perceived—by the Massoretes; thus, in I. Sam. 19/20, the unique form לַהֲקַת appears instead of קְהִלַּת, a construct noun which, taken in combination with the noun following, means, 'the company of the prophets'; in Ps. 68/22, שְׂעָר ('hair') should be רָשָׁע ('a wicked man'), as remarked by Dyserrick and others; in Ps. 77/8, as shown by the parallel in the subsequent clause, הֶשְׁכַּח ('hath he forgotten?') should be הֶחְשַׁךְ ('hath he restrained?'), and similarly, in Deut. 25/9 (e n d) תִּשְׁכָּח לֹא ('thou shalt not forget') should rather be תַּחְשַׂךְ לֹא ('thou shalt not spare'), while, in Deut. 26/13, a like change of the perfect of the same verb must be made. In Zeph. 1/12 instead of the obviously inappropriate יֵיטִיב לֹא ('he shall not do good'), restoration must be made of the resemblant יַבִּיט לֹא, so as to express the arrogant thought regarding God in the mind of those who oppress the poor, 'He does not look'. In Ps. 56/2, the feeble

and inappropriate term אֱנוֹשׁ ('man') should rather be שׂוֹנֵא ('a hater'); in Ps. 22/16, כֹּחִי ('my strength'), to which the querying Note-line has fitly been prefixed, should rather be חִכִּי ('my palate'); and further on, at the beginning of verse 26, מֵאִתְּךָ ('from thee'), which is difficult to harmonise with the context, should rather be, as suggested by Grätz, אֲמִתְּךָ ('thy faithfulness', as the theme of the Psalmist's praise); in Ps. 82/7, as to 'die like one of the princes' is a thought unsuited to the context, הַשָּׂרִים must have been mistranscribed for הָרָשִׁים ('the poor'). Ps. 68/22 for שֵׂעָר read רָשָׁע ('wicked one'). Ps. 76/5 נָאוֹר should be נוֹרָא ('dreadful'); as in verse 8. As Ps. 49 had for its main theme the fate of the godless rich after death, the form קִרְבָּם (rendered 'their inward thought' in the English Versions) at the opening of verse 12, and לַבֹּקֶר ('in the morning') rightly marked by the Note-line, in the middle of verse 15, may safely be regarded as a mistranscription of קִבְרָם ('their grave') and לַקֶּבֶר ('to the grave') respectively. So also, in Ps. 62/7 קֶבֶר אָיִם should be קֶבֶר אָיוֹם ('an awful grave'). In Ex. 32/12 and in Jer. 1/5 for יְדַעְתִּיךָ ('I have known thee'), which is all too mild an expression to suit the context, a better reading is יְעַדְתִּיךָ ('I have appointed thee'); similarly, in Gen. 18/19, for יְדַעְתִּיו ('I know him') it is better to substitute יְעַדְתִּיו ('I have appointed him'). Critics generally agree that וְסָבִיב ('and round about') in Amos 3/11, should be יְסוֹבֵב ('he shall surround'); and that the verb-form לְהָרַע ('to do ill'), in Ps. 15/4 is an error for לְרֵעוֹ ('to his neighbour'), as testified by the Septuagint and the Peshito. In Amos 6/4 (end) for מֵרְבֵּץ read מִבָּקָר to harmonise with מִצֹּאן preceding; same change in I. Sam. 28/24; Jer. 46/21; Mal. 3/21. Isa. 9/11; for וַיֹּאכְלוּ read וְכָלְאוּ. Num. 11/32 read 'and they slew' (וַיִּשְׁחֲטוּ). II. Chr. 25/8 (t w i c e) כָּשַׁל and שָׁכַל ('confused'). Ps. 72/16 (N o t e - l i n e) for בָּאָרֶץ read בָּאוֹצָר ('in the store'). The participle on the strange expression אֵשׁ מִתְלַקַּחַת ('fire taking hold of

itself') found in Exod. 9/24 and Ezek. 1/4 must surely be a mistranscription of מִתְחַלֶּקֶת, which would change the meaning to 'fire dividing itself',—fire displaying itself as tongues of flame, in Exod. 18/22 instead of מֵעָלֶיךָ ('from upon thee'), read עֲמָלֶיךָ ('thy toils'); in Ps. 17/9, for the unworkable בְּנַפֶּשׁ substitute בְּנֶשֶׁף ('in the dark'). In Isa. 24/11, by changing the received form עָרְבָה into עָבְרָה, the meaning of the middle clause, instead of 'all joy has grown dark', become 'all joy has passed away', and thus comes into line with the rest of the verse ; and in II. Sam. 14/16, a more probable reading than יַחַד ('together') is יַדִּיחַ ('will drive out'). In II. Sam. 22/12, the unsuitable form סְכוֹת ('pavilions') should be סְכָּתוֹ ('his pavilion') as found in the parallel passage, Ps. 18/12. In Gen. 38/21, a better reading than מְקוֹמָהּ ('her place') is הַמָּקוֹם, attested by the Samaritan, the Greek, and the Syriac Versions. Instead of the inappropriate form חֲצֵרִים ('village') in Ps. 10/8, a fitting substitute is the resemblant רֹצְחִים ('murderers'); in Ps. 22/10, for the questionable form גֹּחִי (said to mean 'he who drew me') it may be better to read הֹגִי ('he who removed me'). A double transcription has occurred at the close of Isa. 3/12, where וְדֶרֶךְ, and בִּלֵּעוּ should rather be וְרֹדֶיךָ and בָּעֲלוּ, so as to give the meaning required to harmonise with the preceding context, viz. 'and thy tyrants are masters of thy paths'.

The Septuagint, in its renderings, often points to a reading of the Hebrew different from what is given by the Massoretes, because the order of the consonants, as read by the Greek Translator, was not the same as we have received; the context generally indicates what is to be preferred. In Isa. 21/4, the Massoretic form נֶשֶׁף ('twilight') is represented in the Alexandrian Version by φυχή i. e. נֶפֶשׁ ('soul'); in Prov. 27/13, for עָרַב ('he hath become surety'), the Septuagint infelicitously presents παρηλθε, i. e. עָבַר ('he hath passed by'); in Jer. 12/4, the received Hebrew

reading אַחֲרִיתֵנוּ ('our latter end') has been viewed by the Greek translator, who gives ὁδοῦς ἡμῶν, as אָרְחוֹתֵינוּ ('our ways'). Specially noticeable is the opening of Mic. 3/8, where וְאוּלָם ('nevertheless') is represented in the Greek Version by καὶ ἐὰν μὴ, i. e. וְאִם לֹא ('but if not'); and the two-fold illustration in Isa. 22/9 (end), where the Greek translator has read בֵּית הַיָּעַר ('the house of the forest') as בָּתֵּי הָעִיר οἴκους τῆς πόλεως ('houses of the city'); in I. Sam. 20/30, בֹּחֵר ('choosing') should be corrected by the Septuagint (μέτοχος) into חָבֵר ('an associate').

(b) A second group of cases in which transcribers have misplaced letters in the Hebrew text is formed of instances in which necessary elements have been unintelligently detached from one word and attached to another adjoining. This alteration may be called e x t e r n a l transposition.

To understand how such mistakes could be made, it is necessary to remember that at early stages in the literary history of the Hebrews, to economise inscribed material, there was either no space at all left between different words, or so small an interval that readers would have difficulty in perceiving where one word ended and the next begun,— as may be seen in early Codices of the Greek Testament.[1] In some very ancient Semitic inscriptions, indeed, the Moabite Stone (Mesha inscription) and the Siloam inscription, a separating point was placed between words, but in most cases no such guiding mark was used. To read such writing was obviously more or less trying, and the exact meaning intended could not always be made out with certainty; transcribers, accordingly, because of the disadvantages under

---

[1] Thus, the first few words of the Fourth Gospel present the following appearance in Codices, A. B. and (ΕΝΑΡΧΗΗΝΟΛΟΓΟΣ) Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος.

which they laboured, must be leniently judged when they have erred in transmission of what lay before them, even though they have materially altered the meaning of passages in which they committed such errors.

Ps. 62/4 presents a grammatical irregularity in the expression גָּדֵר הַדְּחוּיָה (a masculine noun, undefined, yet combined with a feminine participle, defined by the article) which should be גְּדֵרָה דְּחוּיָה ('a stone fence thrown down'). In Eccles. 7/27, the expression אָמְרָה קֹהֶלֶת should rather be אָמַר הַקֹּהֶלֶת ('saith the Preacher') as in 12/8; in I. Kings 19/21, giving an account of the meal provided by Elisha when called to follow Elijah, the awkward expression בִּשְּׁלָם הַבָּשָׂר ('he cooked them, the flesh') should rather be בִּשֵּׁל מֵהַבָּשָׂר ('he cooked some of the flesh'); similarly, the abnormal construction אֱלֹהֵי מְקָרוֹב and אֱלֹהֵי מֵרָחוֹק in Jer. 23/23 should rather be אֱלֹהִים קְרוֹב and אֱלֹהִים רָחוֹק ('a God at hand', 'a God far off'). The Massoretic text in Ps. 44/5 exhibits the expression אֱלֹהִים צַוֵּה, in which the verb-form is obviously an imperative ('O God, command'); whereas the Septuagint translator, by his rendering (ὁ θεός μου, ὁ ἐντελλόμενος) shows that he read the expression differently, taking the second word as a participle, viz. אֱלֹהַי מְצַוֵּה ('my God, who commandeth'). The expression לִבָּם שָׁלֵם ('their heart is friendly'), in II. Chr. 16/9, does not harmonise well with the context, because the suffix is plural; a smooth reading, however, is obtained in לֵב מְשֻׁלָּם ('a heart resigned', or 'a heart that has made peace'; cf. Isa. 42/19; Josh. 11/19 etc.). The awkward expression אֵת מַה מַּשָּׂא ('what burden?') in Jer. 23/33, when slightly modified in accordance with the spirit of the Septuagint (ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ λῆμμα), assumes a more suitable form אַתֶּם הַמַּשָּׂא ('ye (are) the burden'); and in 17/11, the Massoretic reading עֹשֶׁר וְלֹא ('wealth, but not') is proved by the Alexandrian rendering (πλοῦτον αὐτοῦ, οὐ) to have been read עָשְׁרוֹ לֹא ('his wealth, not'). The first part of the

impracticable reading הַנְּבִיאִים לֵב בְּלֵב הֵישׁ in the Massoretic text of Jer. 23/26, must be recast so that the whole may become יַחְשֹׁב לֵב הַנְּבִיאִים ('the heart of the prophets will invent'). The impossible reading עֶדְרֵי בָקָר ('flocks of (large) cattle') in Joel. 1/18, must be recast so as to become עֵדֶר וּבָקָר ('flock and herd'). At the close of Job. 24/14, the Massoretic reading יְהִי כְגַנָּב ('he becomes like a thief'), if changed so as to become יְהַלֵּךְ גַּנָּב ('the thief stalks'), harmonises better with the first part, in which mention is made of 'the murderer'. At the close of Ps. 56 the expression בְּאוֹר הַחַיִּים ('in the light of life') should be בְּאֹרַח חַיִּים ('in the way of life'), as shown by the context, which speaks of walking; and in Exod. 10/17, as evident from the preceding context, מְעָלַי רַק should be מֵעַל יָרָק ('from upon vegetation'). An ingenious suggestion by Ewald, in Ps. 73/1, is that טוב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל should be טוֹב לְיָשָׁר אֵל ('God is good to an upright man'). A remarkable instance occurs at the close of Isa. 8/8, where a double surprise confronts the reader in אַרְצְךָ עִמָּנוּ אֵל; for the unexpected change to the second person (in 'thy land') and the expression 'God (is) with us' are both inappropriate; a more reasonable arrangement here would be אֶרֶץ לְעַם נוֹאָל ('the land of a foolish people'). In Isa. 9/2, instead of הִגְדַּלְתָּ לַּהַשְׂמָחָה, it may be better to read הִגְדַּלְתָּה שִׂמְחָה ('thou hast heightened joy').

(c) Another class of errors in transcription is formed of cases in which one w o r d or more has been wrongly removed from its proper position and attached elsewhere. An obvious instance is presented at the beginning of Ps. 25/2, where, in accordance with the alphabetic arrangement of the poem, the first word ought to begin with the letter ב; Hitzig has already pointed out that by reading אֱלֹהַי בְּךָ as בְּךָ אֱלֹהַי ('in thee, O my God'), the original and correct arrangement is restored. Transferences have been made from the end of one verse to the beginning of next, or

conversely. An excellent illustration appears when comparison is made of Ps. 42/12 and 43/5—both of which have the same ending, viz. פָּנַי וֵאלֹהָי ('my countenance and my God')—with the end of verse 6, combined with the opening of verse 7 in the latter chapter; at this point, the closing term of verse 6 is פָּנָיו while the next verse begins with אֱלֹהַי; obviously, this last term must be restored to the end of verse 6. In the second chapter of Joel. there is a somewhat infelicitous division between verses 1 and 2 by the Massoretic text; what there appears as the last clause of verse 1, viz. כִּי קָרוֹב ('for near') should rather form the opening of verse 2, which sadly needs a predicate, and would then run more smoothly thus, 'For a day of darkness and deep gloom is at hand'. Assent may safely be given to the view of many critics that וְצִדְקָתְךָ, appearing in the Massoretic Text as the opening term of Ps. 71/19, should rather form the close of verse 18, where, combined with another noun of similar form, viz. גְּבוּרָתְךָ, there would then result the appropriate expression 'thy might and thy righteousness'. The opening words in Ps. 91/8 ('Only with thine eyes shalt thou look') do not commend themselves as appropriate in any way; but if רַק, at the beginning, be changed to its resemblant רָע, and then transferred to the end of verse 7, the verb at this point receives a much needed subject, throwing light on the whole clause, which is now to be rendered 'unto thee shall no evil come near'. In Ps. 10/6, a predicate is obviously required at the close; this want is easily supplied by taking אָלָה, now at the beginning of verse 7 (where it is rightly queried by the Note-line), changing it to its resemblant אֶרְאֶה, and then placing this where it is required for obtaining the suitable expression, 'I shall not see evil'. From the beginning of Nah. 2/8, the perplexing form וְהֻצַּב must be detached, changed to the resemblant וְהֻצַּת, and transferred to the end

of verse 7, the latter half of which will then run thus, 'and the palace shall be shaken and set on fire'.

Special note must be made of a fairly numerous class of passages, in which the arrangement of sentences and verses, as found in the Septuagint or other Ancient Versions, differs from the arrangement in the Massoretic Text. Such divergences from the Hebrew are sometimes due merely to editors or transcribers of these Versions, or even to the primitive translators, and may give little help in improving the received Hebrew text; other difficulties, however, indicate readings which are to be preferred; each case must be estimated separately. In the received Hebrew text the close of verse 2 and the first word in verse 3 in Ps. 90, which is throughout a direct address to the Lord, run thus; אַתָּה אֵל׃ תָּשֵׁב ('Thou (art) God; Thou turnest back'); whereas the corresponding Septuagint rendering (οὐ εἶ μὴ ἀποστρέφῃς) points to a better arrangement, making the division between the verses after 'Thou', and reading אל as the deprecatory אַל, so that the close of verse 2 and the beginning of verse 3 may more correctly be read thus ' . . . from everlasting to everlasting Thou (art). Turn not man back to destruction . . . .' According to the Massoretic Text of Ps. 72/3, the term בְּצֶדֶק ('in righteousness') concludes a somewhat obscure statement regarding mountains and hills; a better arrangement, however, is indicated in the Septuagint, which places the corresponding Greek at the beginning of verse 4, in the declaration regarding the Messianic King, Ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρινεῖ τοὺς πτωχοὺς τοῦ λαοῦ ('In righteousness shall He judge the poor of the people'). The words בְּהִיוֹתֵנוּ בַּשָּׂדֶה now appear at the close of I. Sam. 25/15 in the Massoretic text, and, in conjunction with preceding clauses, form the statement regarding David and his men, 'We missed nothing all the days (during which) we had intercourse with them when we were in

the open field' ; but these two Hebrew words may perhaps more fitly form the beginning of verse 16, as seen in the Septuagint, which opens thus, 'When we were in the open field, they were a wall around us'. Similarly, the words בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ, now appearing in the Massoretic text at the beginning of Jud. 2/15, and forming part of the statement regarding the Israelites, 'In every place (from) which they went out, the hand of the Lord was on them for evil', were, instead, attached by the Septuagint translator to the end of the preceding verse, where we read that the people 'were no longer able to stand before their enemies in any place where they went out'. On the ground of symmetry, the word יְהוָה which has been placed by the 'Massoretes at the beginning of Ps. 5/4, should rather, as indicated in the Septuagint, form the conclusion of verse 3, when it is required as the parallel to 'my King and my God', in the preceding half. The Hebrew editors made the division of Ps. 107/4 a f t e r דֶּרֶךְ, while the Greek translator included this term in the latter half, which he rendered thus, ὁδὸν πόλεως κατοικητηρίου οὐχ εὗρον ('a way to a city they found not'). From the end of Amos 5/1, the Greek Version, disregarding rules regarding gender, detached the expression 'House of Israel', and prefixed it to verse 2, which is then made to begin thus, 'The House of Israel is fallen'. The divine name יְהוָה, placed at the beginning of Ps. 5/4 by the Massoretes, appears, perhaps rightly, as Κύριε, at the end of the preceding verse in the Greek translation.

It is important to note that the very f o r m of some letters, in certain alphabets, particularly when they are small or slight, renders them liable to omission at any part of a word. Thus, examination of the characters used in the Egyptian Aramaic, during the five centuries preceding the Christian Era at once show how readily the letters corresponding to ו, ז, י and ר might be overlooked by a

transcriber ; on this ground, one may understand how the second of the two words in Jud. 18/8 מַה אַתֶּם ('What (are) ye?') should rather be רְאִיתֶם ('have ye seen'), as proved by the correlative verb ('we have seen') in the answer given by the returned explorers (v. 9); on this ground also, at the middle of Nah. 2/9, הִיא may be amended, as הַיְאֹר, and thus enable us to read this, with the form preceding, as 'the waters of the Nile'.

9. OMISSIONS FROM THE MASSORETIC TEXT.

Numerous and varied, though seldom serious, are the omissions which, in course of time, have taken place in the Hebrew text. A complete and orderly distribution of these in distinct classes is impossible, and one must be content with a practical arrangement calculated to be useful for reference, and to show how deviations from the original text have arisen. The whole field may perhaps, be conveniently arranged thus :—

A. Omissions of single letters.
B. Omissions of single words.
C. Omissions of two or more words.

The first of these main divisions may be sub-divided thus :—

(a) Cases in which a single letter has been omitted from the b e g i n n i n g of a word.
(b) Cases in which a letter has been omitted from the e n d of a word.
(c) Cases in which a letter has been dropped from the m i d d l e of a word.

These classes might in their turm be sub-divided, according as there has been omission of adjacent letters or words having the same or similar shapes or sounds ;

but such subdivision might be needlessly minute and rather perplexing.

A. Omissions of single letters.

Attention will first be given to cases in which a single letter has been omitted; but before entering on detailed examination some general remarks, with illustrations, may advantageously be made.

It is important to note that the Hebrew language was, on the whole, averse from the immediate consecution or repetition, anywhere, of the same letter, especially in writing; hence the full form לֵבָב ('heart') was frequently shortened into לֵב; הֲהָרִים has become הָרִים ('mountains'); רבבים now always appears as רַבִּים ('many'); and similarly סָבְבוּ has become סַבּוּ ('they turned'), the strong Dagesh, however, in many of these cases testifying to the original repetition of the second consonant. Instances of a slightly different kind appear in Lev. 13/3, 4, 10, 20, where the form of the second term in the expression הָפַךְ לָבָן ('it has turned white') should rather be לְלָבָן ('to white'); in Job. 23/12, when the first word in מִמִּצְוֹת שְׂפָתָיו is a transcriptional error for מִמִּצְוֹת, as the context, treating of deviation or declension, demands the meaning, 'from the commandments of his lips'; in Prov. 25/19, where the expression מִבְטַח בּוֹגֵד ('trust of a deceiver') ought rather to be מִבְטָח בְּבוֹגֵד ('trust in a deceiver'). In the case of weak consonants, identical and immediately consecutive in the same word, the tendency of one to disappear or merge itself in the other is specially strong. This is seen in such forms as יִרְאוּ, for the full form יִירְאוּ ('they shall fear'). In II. Sam. 1/24 עֲדִי ('an ornament') instead of the plural construct עֲדֵי; in Zeph. 2/6 וְהָיִתָה instead of וְהָיִיתָ ('and thou shalt be'); in Gen. 22/2 אֹמַר instead of אאמר ('I shall say'). Isa. 5/24, לְשׁוֹן and לֶהָבָה should respectively be לְלִשּׁוֹן and לְלֶהָבָה to obtain the meaning required by the context ('by the

tongue of fire', 'by flame'). This omission of one consonant from the side of another with which it ts identical, so that one remains where two should be adjacent, is now known as 'haplography'.

(a) Attention will now be given to cases of haplography in which a letter has been omitted from the b e g i n n i n g of a word because the same letter appears at the e n d of the word immediately preceding; such a case may be called p o s t e r i o r haplography, to distinguish it from one in which the p r e c e d i n g identical letter has been dropped (anterior haplography : see 162—164).

A somewhat frequent omisssion is that of the article (ה) from a definite noun or adjective which immediately follows a word ending with the same letter. Instances appear in II. Kings 20/8, where מָה אוֹת should be מָה הָאוֹת ('what (is) the sign ?'), as attested by the Septuagint (τί τὸ σημειον); in Jer. 12/12, where מִקְצֵה אָרֶץ is a defective reading for מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ[1] ('from the end of the earth') ; see a similar expression, with the normal construction, in the clause immediately following. Specially noteworthy is the defective expression בַּלַּיְלָה הוּא at the beginning of Gen. 32/33, after the normal construction בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא ('during that night') near the end of the preceding verse; also the anarthrous noun in the expression מִי אַתָּה הַר הַגָּדוֹל ('Who art thou, O great mountain ?') in Zech. 4/7; other cases in which the article has similarly disappeared occur in II. Sam. 6/3 ('the new cart'); Jud. 7/19 ('And the hundred men'); I. Sam. 17/17 ('the ten loaves'); Jer. 4/10 ('the sword reacheth'); Joel 3/13 ('the trough (of the wine-press) is full'); Ex. 2/6 ('behold, the child was weeping'); Ezek. 7/9 ('I the Lord am the smiter'); Jer. 6/16 ('where is the way ?') Jer. 11/19, ('let us destroy the tree'); Jer. 49/19 ('Who is the shepherd ?').

---

1) See the Kethib and the Qeri in Jer. 15/13.

Though the partiele ה, normally marking the beginning of a question (see Gen. 29/4, 5, 15, 25 ; 42/22 ; 43/7, 27, (twice), 29 ; 44/15, 19, etc.) is sometimes omitted, (and the nature of the sentence thus left to be inferred from the context, or from the tone of voice as in I. Sam. 16/4 ; 21/16; II. Sam. 16/17 ; 18/29 ; Ps. 121/1 etc.), yet there are passages in which the omission may rather be due to the immediate precedence of another ה at the end of the word before ; this appears to be the most reasonable explanation of the question אַף כִּי אָמַר ('Hath He actually said ?'), in Gen. 3/1 ; זֹאת הָעִיר ('Is this the city ?') in Zeph. 2/15.

Posterior haplography in the case ot other letters is seen in Amos 7/2 and 5, where the impossible reading מִי יָקוּם יַעֲקֹב ('who shall arise, Jacob ?') must be a scribal error for מִי יִקֹּם לְיַעֲקֹב ('who would take vengeance on Jacob ?') ; in Isa. 44/5, where ב must be restored before the last term in the expression זֶה יִכְתֹּב יָדוֹ in order to obtain the meaning required by the context (viz. 'this one shall write with his hand'); in I. Chr. 16/17, where לְ—as shown by the clause immediately preceding ('to Jacob, for an ordinance')—has been omitted from before the second word in the expression לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרִית, and must be restored so as to secure the sense required (viz. 'to Israel, for a covenant') ; in Nah. 3/12, where כ originally stood at the beginning of the second of the two words מִבְצָרַיִךְ תְּאֵנִים, to obtain the sense obviously demanded by the context (viz. 'thy strongholds (are) like fig-trees') ; in Num. 4/19, where ת has obviously been dropped from the beginning of the verb-form in[1] זֹאת עֲשׂוּ ('this do ye'), as the meaning required is rather 'this shall ye do'. In Isa. 1/20, חֶרֶב is not a ('questionable') 'instrumental accusative', but rather an instance of posterior haplography for מֵחֶרֶב, the מ having been omitted after the

[1] Observe the Note-line at this point in the Massoretic text.

same letter at the close of the preceding word; with the verb following, the sense clearly becomes 'with the sword shall ye be devoured' (on the construction, compare Gen. 9/11; Ruth 1/5; Ps. 37/23 etc.). Other examples appear in Ps. 60/11, where מִי נָחַנִי ('who hath led me?') should rather be מִי יַנְחֵנִי ('who will lead me?'), as shown by the Septuagint (τίς ὁδηγήσει με); in Job. 19/27, where the verb-form in the expression עֵינַי רָאוּ ('mine eyes have seen') is a transcriptional error for יִרְאוּ, which gives the sense required ('mine eyes shall see'); in Num. 14/9, where the strange expression כִּי לַחְמֵנוּ הֵם ('for they are our bread') must originally have been כִּי יִלָּחֲמוּ הֵם ('when they fight us'). In Zach. 13/9, near the end, an omitted ו must be restored before the last verb in the expression אֶעֱנֶה אֹתוֹ אָמַרְתִּי, so as to secure the sense required by the context ('I will answer him and will say'). The impracticable expression at the beginning of Gen. 23/11, לֹא אֲדֹנִי שְׁמָעֵנִי is satisfactorily rectified when modified thus; לְוֹא אֲדֹנִי יִשְׁמָעֵנִי ('O that my lord would hear me').

(b) Attention will now be given to cases of anterior haplography, i. e. those in which the first of two letters, identical and consecutive, but in different words, has been omitted, while the second has been retained. A two-fold example is seen in I. Sam. 24/18, where the expression וְאַתָּה הִגַּדְתָּ הַיּוֹם, if more fully written, would be וְאַתָּה הִגַּדְתָּ הַיּוֹם ('but thou hast told to-day'). More decided cases of anterior omission in Ex. 32/4, where the former of the two terms in וַיִּקַּח מִיָּדָם should be וַיִּקָּחֵם which more explicitly expresses the thought required ('and he (Aaron) took them (the earrings of the idolatrous Israelites) from them'); in I. Sam. 28/9, stating that Saul cut off the wizard out of the land, where, instead of הַיִּדְּעֹנִי מִן הָאָרֶץ, the plural הַיִּדְּעֹנִים ('the wizards') should appear; as in verse 3, as actually found here in some MSS., and as required by another plural in

the clause preceding. In Ps. 78/4, where the writer, speaking for himself and others, and mentioning the things which had been made known to them by their fathers, says,[1] לֹא נְכַחֵד מִבְּנֵיהֶם, but the verb-form here must be נְכַחֲדֵם, in order to express fully the thought obviously intended ('we will not hide them from their children'); and in Isa. 22/21, and 8/14, instead of the singular form of the first word in the expression לְיֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם, we expect the plural לְיֹשְׁבֵי ('to the inhabitants of Jerusalem'). Isa. 9/5, instead of פֶּלֶא ('a wonderful t h i n g') read פֶּלְאִי ('A wonderful p e r s o n'). In Jer. 19/16, there appear the words הִנְנִי מֵבִי אֶל, but the Massoretes note that the second form here should properly be מֵבִיא (for correct expression of the meaning, 'Behold, I am bringing to . . .') (see also I. Kings 21/21); and in II. Kings 13/6, where the received text states regarding Jerusalem ('he caused Israel to sin'), הֶחֱטִי אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל is noted by the Massoretes as the correct form of the verb; see a similar omission in Jer. 32/35. A difficulty in construction is presented by the first two words of Ps. 42/2, viz. כְּאַיָּל תַּעֲרֹג inasmuch as the noun is masculine while the verb-form with which it is immediately associated is feminine; it is certainly possible to remove the difficulty by changing the latter into the masculine form יַעֲרֹג, and thus secure the meaning 'As a hart (that) longs'[2], but more probably the noun instead ought to be the corresponding feminine form אַיָּלֶת ('a hind'); (see the form in Jer. 14/5) from which the final letter has disappeared haplographically before

---

1) The Note-line indicates that the inserting scribe perceived there was something wrong in the text at this point.

2) That this is a relative clause, with the connecting sign omitted, is obvious from other instances in which the כ indicating comparison appears: see Isa. 61/11 (double case); Jer. 11/19; Job. 7/2 (double case), etc.

the same letter beginning the word immediately following. Of the words forming the latter half of Ps. 38/9, viz. שָׁאַגְתִּי מִנַּהֲמַת לִבִּי ('I have roared by reason of the disquietness of my heart', English Versions), the concluding term cannot be right, for the primary meaning of the preceding term which is placed in construction before it, is the roaring or growling of a lion,—and one cannot speak of the roaring of a 'heart'; Hitzig, however, pointed out that the original form of the third word must have been לָבִיא ('a lion', Gen. 49/9; Num. 24/9; Deut. 33/20 etc.) from which, however, the final א was haplographically omitted before the א beginning of next verse; the clause, thus restored, may now be rendered, 'I have roared (louder) than the growling of a lion'.

(c) Letters omitted which are different from others adjacent.

(d) There are cases in which single letters have obviously been omitted, especially at the end of a word, not on haplographical grounds, but rather perhaps through the inadvertence of scribes. Thus, the traditional rendering at the end of Prov. 12/21, that 'the wicked are full of evil' may be regarded as a truism, and certainly does not form a fitting parallel to the contrasted statement in the first clause, that 'no misfortune will befall the righteous man'; but by assuming that רָע is a transcriptional error for רָעַד (pausal form of the segholate noun), there is obtained the suitable thought that the 'unrighteous are full of trembling', through fear of the consequences of their sins. Similarly, in Prov. 13/12, satisfaction is felt with the statement in the first half of the verse, that 'Hope deferred sickens the heart', but something is perceived to be wrong with the text in the second half, which, in its received form, declares by way of contrast that 'desire which has become (or, 'has been fulfilled') is a tree of life'; when, however,

עֵץ ('tree') is set aside in favour of עֹצֶם an acceptable parallel is obtained in the statement, 'but a fulfilled desire (is) a strength of life'. At the beginning of Ps. 52/7, a more revelant reading than גַּם אֵל ('God also') seems to be גֹּמֵל אֵל ('God (is) a requirer'), inasmuch as the context treats of divine retribution. Isa. 53/8 read (at end) נֻגַּע לָמוֹ he was beaten to death. Ps. 40/10 for צֶדֶק, read צִדְקָךְ (see Note-line, and the parallel). Other corrective restorations must be made in Gen. 37/17, where שָׁמַעְתִּי should be שְׁמַעְתִּים ('I heard them'); in Isa. 2/5, where בְּאוֹר ('in the light') should be בְּאֹרַח ('in the way'); in Ps. 36/10 'in thy light shall we see a way' (נִרְאֶה אֹרַח). Ps. 39/12 כָּעָשׁ ('like the moth') should be כֶּעָשָׁן ('like the smoke'); in Ps. 141/3, where, as Perles justly observes[1], דַּל should be דֶּלֶת so as to give the meaning obviously required ('the door of my lips').

It is to be noted that the letter ר seems to show a special tendency to disappear from the end of a word; instances are found in Ps. 66/9, where הַשָּׂם ('who placeth') should be הַשֹּׁמֵר ('who preserveth'); in Jud. 13/12, where יָבֹא should be בָּאֵר ('explain fully'); in Gen. 37/3, where וַיָּבֵא ('and he brought') should be וַיְבָאֵר ('and he explained fully'). Isa. 5/6 for בָּתָה read בְּתֹהוּ ('in confusion). Eccl. 7/19 for תָּעוּז read תַּעֲזֹר.

B. Omissions of single words.

Inadvertent omission of a letter or letters from within a word may be accepted as sufficient to account for the occurrence of unintelligible or unworkable forms in the Massoretic Text. A clear case appears in Ps. 68/5, which presents a series of exhortations to praise the Lord and be glad in him; a brief clause, however, בְּיָהּ שְׁמוֹ ('in Jah. his

---

[1] Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments (München, 1895) page 30.

name') disturbs the flow; but when the second of these words is recognised as a mistranscription of שִׂמְחוּ, the whole runs smoothly, for the clause then means, 'In Jah, rejoice'. Amos. 4/9 contains an unworkable infinitive הַרְבּוֹת ('to multiply'); but when this is changed to חֲחֵרַבְתִּי ('I have laid waste') as suggested by Wellhausen, difficulty disappears. Isa. 9/11 for פֶּה read פֵּאָה. I. Sam. 17/8 בְּרוּ, בַּחֲרוּ. Zach. 9/6 for וְהִכְרַתִּי read וְהִכְרַעְתִּי ('bring low'). Ps. 69/13 for בִּי יָשִׂיחוּ substitut יְשַׂחֲקוּ לִי this verb indicates sober meditation, not scoffing, as required by the context. The form לֵאמֹר ('saying') at the beginning of Jer. 3/1, cannot be vindicated, and only becomes intelligible when regarded as a corruption of לֵךְ אֱמֹר ('Go, say !'), addressed to the prophet. The context of Neh. 5/11 shows that מְאַת הַכֶּסֶף (usually taken to mean 'the hundredth part of the money') must be a transcriptional error for מַשַּׁאת הַכֶּסֶף ('the interest of the money' borrowed). The strange expression שִׂימוּ לָכֶם עָלֶיהָ in Jud. 19/30 is a manifest error for שִׂימוּ לִבְּכֶם עָלֶיהָ ('set your mind to it'), as shown by Isa. 41/22 ; Hag. 2/15, 18 etc. The forms of חֹק and חֻקָּם in Gen. 47/22 should respectively be חֵלֶק ('a portion') and חֶלְקָם ('their portion'). That whole 'peoples' should be dismayed at the approach of locust-swarms is hardly probable ; but if עַמִּים in Joel 2/6 be treated as a clerical error for עֲצֻמִים ('strong men'), difficulty disappears ; similarly, further on in the same chapter (2/17), it is unlikely that the priests would be commanded to 'weep' between the porch and the altar ; but יִבְכּוּ may safely be regarded as a mistranscription of יִבְרְכוּ ('let them kneel'). In Ex. 8/19, the impossible פְּדוּת, פְּדוּת ('ransom') can only be a lost form פִּירְדוּת פַּרְדֻת ('separation'), as shown by the context ; in 5/9, יִשְׁעוּ should rather be יִשְׁמְעוּ ('listen to'). In Ps. 60/5, the questionable construct form in the expression שָׁטֵי כָזָב (alleged to mean 'those who turn aside to falsehood') should rather be שִׁטְחֵי, which gives the relevant sense, ('those who

spread falsehood') ; in Ps. 52/7, at the beginning, a more relevant reading than גַּם אֵל ('God also') seems to be the resemblant גְּמֹל אֵל ('God (is) a requiter') inasmuch as the context treats of divine retribution ; in 60/5, הִרְאִיתָ ('thou hast caused to see') is a form less probable than הִקְרֵאתָ, which makes the whole clause mean, 'thou hast caused hardship to befall thy people' (on the construction, cf. Jer. 32/23). That the unsatisfactory form בְּעֹד, in Ps. 39/2, should rather be the construct infinitive בַּעֲמֹד ('in standing') is shown by the context and by the Septuagint (ἐν τῷ συστῆναι). In I. Sam. 20/25, critics generally agree that וַיָּקָם ('and he rose up') should rather be וַיְקַדֵּם, which gives a more appropriate statement ('and Jonathan was in front'). A two-fold omission seems to have been made in Ps. 68/11, where the inappropriate expression יָשְׁבוּ בָּהּ ('they dwelt therein') should more fitly be יִשְׂבְּעוּ בְרִיָּה ('they were abundantly satisfied with fine food'), as the preceding context tells of the manna provided in the desert.

Disappearance of a letter from the b e g i n n i n g of a word—except in cases of posterior haplography—is more rare, but some instances may be noted. The first part of Neh. 5 describes the dire poverty to which many of the returned Exiles had been reduced ; some had to pledge their possessions, and some even their own persons, to the money-lenders ; Verse 2, in its Massoretic form, relates that there were some who said 'Our sons, our daughters, and we ourselves are many, that we may get bread, and eat and live' ; but as one can hardly feel satisfied with the statement that the hapless ones were 'many' there need be little hesitation in concluding that רַבִּים here is a transcriptional error for עֲרֻבִים, which gives a clearer view of the situation ('we are mortgaged'). In I. Sam. 3/13, the form לָהֶם can hardly be justified, and is doubtless a transcriptional error for אֱלֹהִים, as shown by the Septuagint (θεὸν).

Instead of the unique verb-form פַּסּוּ in Ps. 12/2, read the acknowledged resemblant אָפְסוּ ('disappear, vanish'); in 22/14, for אַרְיֵה read כְּאַרְיֵה ('like a lion'), as required by the context. Ps. 44/3 shows יָדְךָ ('thy hand') with the Note-line prefixed, to question the correctness of the form, which should be לְבַדְךָ in order to give the sense (viz. 'thou alone') required by the context especially the succeeding verse. In Ps. 90/10 instead of כִּי גָז, read כִּי נִגְזוּ ('for we are cut off'), or perhaps simply נִגְזוּ ('we are cut off'). Instead of נְגִינָתִי in Ps. 77/7, it is better to read מִנְגִינָתִי ('my ribald mocking') as in Lam. 3/63. Josh. 2/1, for the חֶרֶשׁ read (as adverbial infin.) הַחֲרֵשׁ ('silently'). Josh. 2/4 for כֵּן read אָכֵן ('verily') cf. Gen. 28/16; Ex. 2/14. Isa. 2/16 where כָּלוּ should be the verb נָכְלוּ ('deceive').

N. B. A remarkable case of double omission of מ from the side of י, because of likeness in ancient script, occurs in Ps. 79/9, where אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעֵנוּ should be אֱלֹהִים מוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ as shown by the LXX Θξος ὁ σῶεηρυμεν.

Omission of more than one letter sometimes occurs. Isa. 3/25 at the beginning מְתֵיךְ should be אֵימָתֵךְ ('thy terrifying ones') should be read, to accord with the corresponding גְּבוּרָתֵךְ, in the next number. Ps. 68/15, the inexplicable form בָּהּ becomes more acceptable if changed to בְּהָלָה ('terror').

(a) Weak consonants specially liable to omission.

The weakness of some consonants, especially the vowel-letters (א, ה, ו, י), as already indicated and the aspirates (א, ה, ע) is a common cause of their omission and of resultant errors in transcription of the text; some instances of their disappearance from the middle of a word have already been given, but others may now be added. In I. Sam. 25/8, the Massoretes themselves have noted that בָּנוּ should be בָּאנוּ ('we have come'); in Eccl. 4/14, הָסוּרִים is defectively written for הָאֲסוּרִים ('the prisoners'); in Prov. 13/1

מוּסַר אָב ('correction of a father') should rather be מוֹסֵר אֹהֵב ('a lover of correction'), as in 12/1 ; in Ps. 3/2 and 25/19 רַבּוּ ('they are many') should rather be רָהֲבוּ ('they harass'). Ps. 32/6 רַבִּים should perhaps be רָהָבִים ('raging', 'fierce', or 'angry'). Isa. 8/15 for בָּם read בַּיּוֹם (in the day time). Isa. 7/17 יָמִים ('days') should rather be אֵימִים ('fierce ones'). Isa. 13/20 יַהֵל for יֵאָהֵל. In II. Sam. 22/42, יְשָׁעוּ ('they looked') should rather be יְשַׁוְּעוּ ('they cried'), as shown by the parallel in Ps. 18/42 ; in Amos. 9/12 אֱדוֹם ('Edom') has been read as אָדָם by the Septuagint translator (see also Acts. 15/17). In Amos. 8/8 כָּאוֹר should rather be כַּיְאֹר ('like the Nile') ; in Mic. 1/2, a more appropriate form than לְעֵד ('for a witness') would be לְיֹעֵד ('for an arraigner') ; in Prov. 28/2 רַבִּים ('many') should be רִיבִים ('contentions') ; in Isa. 1/27, the unsuitable form וְשָׁבֶיהָ ('and her returning ones') should be וְיֹשְׁבֶיהָ ('and her inhabitants'). Omission of ע has taken place in Zach. 1/3, where אֱלֹהֵם should be אֶל הָעָם ('to the people') ; in Ps. 28/8, לָמוֹ should be לְעַמּוֹ as shown in the Septuagint ('to his people', as in 29/11) ; in Mic. 1/10, where בָּכוּ should be בְּעַכּוֹ ('in Accho') ; in Amos. 8/8, where the Massoretes have rightly noted that ינשקה should be וְנִשְׁקְעָה, a fitting term to express the thought that the land would be 'submerged'. The name of the Babylonian diety בֵּל Isa. 46/1 ; Jer. 50/2 etc. is a contraction of בְּעֵל (Heb. בַּעַל 'lord') ; and the precatory monosyllable בִּי ('pray.') is similarly contracted from בְּעִי (Gen. 44/18 ; Ex. 4/10, 13 etc.). In Ps. 22/16, the Hophal participle מְדֻבָּק does not construe so well as the Hiphil מַדְבִּיק ('glues together'). In Ps. 68/5, the third form from the end, שְׁמוֹ ('his name') gives no suitable sense, and should be the imperative שִׂמְחוּ ('be glad').

Omissions from the text have also occurred through fading of letters from MSS.

A double instance seems to be presented in Ps. 38/11,

where the incomprehensible גַּם הֵם seems to have been originally גָּמַר חֶמֶד. Of these two words, the first is required as the predicate for the two preceding words, so that the clauselet may become 'and the light of mine eyes hath failed'; while the second forms a fitting factor for making an appropriate finish to the verse 'desire — there is none with me'.

In Nah. 2/9, the unintelligible combination מִימֵי הִיא presented in the text may probably be best amended by assuming that the two forms should rather be כְּמֵימֵי הַיְאוֹר ('like the waters of the Nile') from which the first consonant of the first word and the last consonant of the second had disappeared through damage that had befallen the MS. from which a copyist transmitted what remained. Isa. 5/9 for בְּאָזְנֵי read אָמַר, and further on, for גְּדוֹלִים וְטוֹבִים read גַּלִּים וְתִלִּים ('stone heaps and ruin-mounds'). Isa. 5/14 for לִבְלִי חֹק read לִבְלֹעַ חֵלֶק ('to swallow up spoil').

(b) Omission of words causing difficulty.

1. Omission of an entire word is frequently due to similarity, in sound or form, to an adjoining one, which still remains.

The Massoretes have properly noted the omission of כֵּן before בֵּן in II. Sam. 18/20, and the omission in Jud. 20/13 before בְּנֵימִין of בְּנֵי, which is obviously required to form the plural nominative ('and the children of Benjamin') demanded by the plural predicate. Similarly, in Jer. 31/17, it has been noted that the plural participle בָּאִים has been omitted before the third word (which it resembles) in the obviously incomplete expression הִנֵּה יָמִים נְאֻם יְהוָה, so that the full meaning required ('Behold, days (are) coming, saith the Lord') may be given; the complete expression indeed is found in many Hebrew Manuscripts, and is indicated in the Ancient Versions. An obviously incomplete statement appears in the Massoretic Text of Gen. 47/16,

giving Joseph's offer to the famishing Egyptians, 'I will give to you in return for your cattle'; after the expression אֶתְּנָה לָכֶם there has been omitted the required resemblant לֶחֶם ('bread'), as shown in the Samaritan and the Septuagint (ξώρω ὑμῖν ἄρτους). Ps. 31/20 from before פָּעַלְתָּ the cognate noun פֹּעַל has been omitted ('thou didst work a work') see Ps. 44/2; Hab. 1/5. Ps. 35/11 the context shows it is probable that before עֵדֵי there has fallen out עָלַי, so that we should read 'there rise against me (false) witness of . . .'. In Hebrew, 'to make a covenant' is normally expressed by כָּרַת בְּרִית; hence, when the noun is not found in the text of I. Kings 8/9 we are justified in concluding that the word has been inadvertently omitted by a transcriber. Isa. 8/19 (at end) read אֵל אֶל הַמֵּתִים ('not to the dead'). Isa. 7/24, a noun (as nominative) is required between the two words יָבֹא שָׁמָּה; the insertion of אִישׁ supplies the want.

The mediaeval Jewish editors, however, have noted the omission of אֵלַי in Ruth 3/17, before the second word in the expression אָמַר אַל תָּבֹא; some Hebrew Manuscripts give the full reading ('he said to me, Do not go'), which is further confirmed by the Syriac and the Targum. The restoration, in I. Sam. 9/16, of עָנְיִי before the last word (which it closely resembles) in the expression רָאִיתִי אֶת עַמִּי, is required to complete the thought obviously intended ('I have seen the distress of my people'). There is an obvious omission in I. Sam. 13/8, of אָמַר after the second of the three words לַמּוֹעֵד אֲשֶׁר שְׁמוּאֵל, which must be rectified to give the meaning obviously required ('till the appointed time which Samuel had stated'); see a similar case in II. Chr. 34/22; Pro. 6/5 (which may fairly be rendered, on the basis of the Massoretic text, 'Deliver thyself, like a gazelle from a hand; and like a bird from the hand of a fowler') is manifestly incomplete at the end of the first half; on the assumption, however, that the correct reading

at that point is not simply מִיָּד but מִיַּד צַיָּד ('from the hand of a hunter'), satisfactory parallelism is secured. At the beginning of Jer. 50/34, the whole of which forms a strong contrast to the statement in the preceding verse, describing the oppression of the people of Israel and Judah, there is a notable absence of a term fitted to indicate the obvious antithesis, and the Note-line has been inserted to show that something essential is wanting; the lack is most suitably supplied if וְאֵלָם (Gen. 48/19; Job. 1/11; 12/7 etc.) be prefixed to גֹּאֲלָם חָזָק, and the first part of the verse, accordingly, comes to mean, "nevertheless their Redeemer is strong". In the Massoretic text of II. King 7/1, containing Elisha's brief prediction of speedy relief to Samaria from the severe famine consequent on the siege by the Syrians, a Note-line calls attention to the incompleteness of the recorded announcements, 'To-morrow, a measure of fine flour for a shekel, and two measures of barley for a shekel, in the gate of Samaria'; from beside מָחָר, a transcriber has evidently omitted the resemblant verb-form יִמָּכֵר, but when this is restored, the whole sentence becomes clear ('To-morrow, there shall be sold a measure of fine flour. . . .'). Among other corrections required in the received form of David's lament over Saul and Jonathan, the defective reading אַל־טַל in II. Sam. 1/21 should be אַל־יִזַּל טַל ('let not dew distil'). In the Massoretic text of II. Chr. 35/21, the context plainly proves that לֹא עָלֶיךָ is incomplete as a sentence, which requires עָלַיְתִי for adequate expression of the idea to be conveyed ('I have not come up against thee'). Noteworthy are the cases in which, originally, both of the two identically sounded words לוֹ לֹא were found in immediate consecution (in such an expression as 'he said to him, No'), though now only one of the two appears in the Massoretic text; the pronominal form alone appears in I. Sam. 2/16 and 10/19, while the negative alone occurs in

Gen. 19/2 and II. Sam. 8/19. As indicated by the reading in the Septuagint (ἢ θὲ χάλαζα), and required by the context, in the middle of Exod. 9/24, restoration must be made of וְהַבָּרָד ('and the hail') immediately after the simpler form בָּרָד ; similarly, as attested by the Septuagint (καὶ πῦρ), וָאֵשׁ ('and fire') has inadvertently been omitted before וְאֵשָׁלְחָה in transcribing. As a covenant is not made between things, but, on both sides, between persons, correction must be made of the Massoretic Text in Gen. 21/23, where Abimelech is represented as requesting Abraham to form a treaty of friendship, not merely with himself but also ('with the land'); the received text עִם הָאָרֶץ must originally have been עִם עַם הָאָרֶץ ('with the people of the land'). The last clause in the Hebrew text of Exod. 5/16, forming part of the complaint to Pharaoh, by the oppressed Hebrews, shows the faulty reading וְחָטָאת עַמֶּךָ, which ought either to be וְחַטָּאת עַמֶּךָ ('but blame (lies) with thee'), or more probably perhaps, through restoration of a vanished preposition from the side of a resemblant noun-form וְחַטָּאת עִם עַמֶּךָ ('but blame (lies) with thy people')[1]. To restore the balance between the two clauses of Ps. 31/15, each consisting of four words, it seems necessary, in the second members, to insert אֵלֶיךָ before its resemblant אֱלֹהַי, so that the whole may run smoothly; 'But as for me, in thee have I trusted; I said unto thee, Thou art my God'. The Massoretic Text in Exod. 2/21 terminates rather abruptly with the statement that Jethro 'gave Zipporah his daughter to Moses'; the Septuagint, however, which ends with γυναῖκα, shows that the original ending, in Hebrew לְמֹשֶׁה לְאִשָּׁה, must have been dropped unconsciously because of its resemblance to the preceding; see the constructions in Gen. 12/19; 25/20; and especially 29/28; 30/4, 9; 34/8 etc. Ps. 68/22 before קָדְקֹד, where

1) See another suggestion on page 165.

a v e r b is required to balance the verse, restore יִדְקֹר ('he shall pierce'). Isa. 5/2 there is wanting a d a t i v e of the verb-form וַיְקַו (see Isa. 8/17 ; 25/9 ; 33/2; 60/9); the defect is remedied by adding לוֹ which might easily drop out before לַעֲשׂוֹת which follows similarly in verse 4. Isa. 7/14 אֶת has been omitted after וְקָרָאתָ. Isa. 7/2 אֶל has been omitted after יִשְׂרָאֵל. In Ps. 31/12, after לִשְׁכֵנַי the pron. אֲנִי has probably been omitted, because of its similarity in sound and form to the latter part of the noun. In the middle of Ps. 37/28, the alphabetic arrangement of the whole poem demands the resuscitation, before לְעוֹלָם, of a noun beginning with ע as the subject in the clause ; the term required is evidently עַוָּלִים, which was unconsciously passed over by a transcriber because of its likeness to the succeeding word ; but as the w h o l e of the second half of the verse treats of the d e s t r u c t i o n of the wicked, while the whole of the first half describes the Lord's loving regard for his own, the verb-form נִשְׁמְרוּ ('are preserved') further must obviously be viewed as a mistranscription of נִשְׁמָדוּ ; when these two amendments are affected, the latter half of the verse presents the homogeneous thought, antithetical to that of the former ('unjust ones are destroyed forever, and the seed of the unrighteous is cut off'). At the beginning of Ps. 34/18, before the verb צָעֲקוּ, the resemblant form צַדִּיקִים must be re-inserted to obtain the necessary statement, 'The righteous cry' ; the Septuagint confirms the restoration. In Ps. 50/16, דְּבָרִי has probably been inadvertently omitted from before בְּרִיתִי, as the context leads one to think that the reading should be 'the words of my covenant'. Deut. 3/20 and Josh. 1/15, as indicated by the Note-line in both passages אֱלֹהֵיכֶם has been omitted from before לַאֲחֵיכֶם. Ps. 35/26, as the last clause is remarkably short,it seems possible that the inf. עָלָי has been omitted before עָלַי whichit closely resemble salso; in v.21 עָנְיוּ, as a resemblant עֵינֵנוּ has probably been dropped.

The received Hebrew text further presents passages from which, inadvertently, a word u n l i k e others immediately adjacent has been omitted. Obviously, a transcriber in copying II. Sam. 3/7, has failed to give the name of 'Ishbosheth' (mentioned in the next verse) as the person who reproved Abner for taking liberties with his father's concubine. Confessedly, also, at the beginning of I. Sam. 13/1, there is an omission in stating the age of Saul when he began to reign ; בֶּן שָׁנָה ('a year old') is an impossible reading, and such a number as 'thirty' must be re-inserted. Before the definite accusative אֶת כָּל יֶרֶךְ עֵשָׂו in Gen. 1/30, there must be restored the governing verb נָתַתִּי ('I have given'), as found in the preceding verse, to which this forms a parallel. That the form שְׁנֵיהֶם must be re-inserted, in Gen. 2/24, after the first term in וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד, in order to present the full meaning required by the context ('and they two shall become one flesh'), is attested by the Peshito, Samaritan, Targum, Vulgate, Philo, Septuagint (καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν) and the New Testament (Matt. 19/5; Mark 10/8 ; I. Chr. 6/16 ; Eph. 5/31). In the account of the transaction between Jeremiah and his nephew Hanameël, the latter is correctly referred to by the prophet, in 32/7, 8, 9, as בֶּן דּוֹדִי ('son of my uncle'), but later, in verse 32, 'son' has been inadvertently omitted by a transcriber and דּוֹדִי alone appears.

C. Omissions of two or more words.

Inadvertent omissions, in transcription, of t w o o r m o r e w o r d s, may be detected now and again. Gen. 4/8, according to the Massoretic text, may be rendered 'And Cain said to Abel his brother ; and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain arose against Abel his brother, and slew him' ; but obviously the first verb-

form וַיֹּאמֶר[1] lacks completion ; this is adequately supplied, however, by the Septuagint translator, who gives us the words of Cain thus, Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον, נֵלְכָה הַשָּׂדֶה ('Let us go to the field'). Ps. 145 is obviously alphabetic, but the Massoretic text wants the verse beginning with נ which should follow verse 13 ; the missing stanza, however, has been recovered by means of the Septuagint, which begins thus, Πιστὸς Κύριος, i. e. נֶאֱמָן יְהוָה ('Faithful is the Lord'. .). Under the category of omissions must be placed 'anacoloutha',—cases in which, after a sentence has been begun, the continuation reasonably expected does not follow,[2] an early example, marked by the Note-line, appears in Gen. 3/22, where the Lord is represented as saying, after Adam and Eve had sinned by eating the forbidden fruit, 'Now therefore, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever. . . .' Another incomplete statement appears in Ex. 19/25, where account is given for the warnings addressed to the Israelites not to approach Mount Sinai ; 'And Moses went down to the people, and said unto them. . . .' An additional example, in the style of Deuteronomy (see 11/13, 22 ; 28/1), occurs at the end of Zach. 6/15 ; 'and it shall come to pass, if ye will attentively listen to the voice of the Lord your God. . . .'.

---

1) To translate this verb-form by 'and he talked', or 'and he spake' is hardly legitimate, and is calculated to conceal the hiatus following.

2) Such cases, however, must be distinguished from instances of 'aposiopesis', in which, generally under the influence of strong feeling, the latter part of a sentence is left to be understood, as in Gen. 17/18 ('O, if Ishmael were to live!'), Num. 14/2 ('O, if we had died!'). Ps. 95/11 ('If they shall enter into my rest!').

10. ADDITIONS TO THE ORIGINAL HEBREW TEXT.

Careful study must be made of the additions which, in the cause of manifold transcription, have been made to the original Hebrew text, inasmuch as these frequently present difficulties which can be solved through their removal. An exact classification is perhaps unattainable; but for the sake of clearness, it may be best to consider (a) cases in which a single letter has been added, and then (b) those in which whole word-forms have been introduced.

A numerous and interesting class is that of Dittograms, i. e. instances in which the same letter has been needlessly repeated. It will be convenient to consider instances in which the same letter has been irregularly repeated in the same word. A simple illustration appears in Isa. 63/2, where the unwarranted form לִלְבוּשֶׁךָּ ('to thine apparel') has compelled many translators and expositors, who retained this reading, to introduce supplementary words and to frame periphrastic renderings of the whole clause (as in the English Versions, 'Wherefore (art thou) red in thine apparel') whereas, by reading לִבוּשֶׁךָ, the course of thought at once flows smoothly ('Wherefore (is) thine apparel red?'). Disturbance is caused in Lev. 27/12 by the sudden appearance of the suffixed form כְּעֶרְכְּךָ, which, combined with the form succeeding, must be rendered, 'according to thy valuation, O priest', whereas, by reading כְּעֶרֶךְ, the meaning naturally and appropriately becomes 'according to the valuation of the priest'[1]. Similarly in Jer. 31/22, the questionable form יְבָרֶכְךָ requires us, somewhat awkwardly, to render the clause which it begins, 'The Lord bless thee, O habitation of righteousness', whereas יְבָרֵךְ, the simpler

---

[1] See, however, the form 'according to thy valuation' addressed to the whole community, in verses 15—19.

and more probable reading, gives a more suitable reading, 'May the Lord bless the habitation of righteousness'. Of the two words יוֹמָם וָלַיְלָה in Jer. 30/20, 25, the first, which properly means 'by day' (as in Ex. 13/21 twice, 22,— Jud. 6/27 etc.), should here be simply יוֹם, inasmuch as the meaning required by the context is 'day and night' (as in Gen. 8/22). In II. Chr. 15/3, the Note-line calls attention to the remarkable reading לְלֹא, thrice repeated, for which the simple לֹא should be found instead.

(a) Another class of dittograms—somewhat numerous—is formed of words in which the first letter is an echo or repetition of the last letter in the word immediately preceding; such instances may, for convenience, be called 'posterior' dittograms[1].

The received text cf. II. Chr. 16/8 and 22/24 shows the reading חַיִל לָרוֹב ('an army in abundance'), but a simpler and more normal reading would be חַיִל רַב ('a numerous army'), as in Ezek. 38/15. Of the three words כָּלְאוּ שָׁמַיִם מִטָּל in Hag. 1/10, the last should merely be טַל, which will then admit of the whole clause being reasonably rendered ('the heavens have withholden dew'). In Josh. 10/21, the second of the two words in the expression יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאִישׁ, should simply be אִישׁ, in order to form the proper construction and give the meaning required by the context, ('against the children of Israel, not a single person pointed his tongue'), the construction בְּהַשְׂכִּיל לְחָכָם in Prov. 21/11 is decidedly strange; but when the ל before the second word is removed, as a dittogram from the end of the first, a normal construction, giving an appropriate meaning, is secured ('when a wise man ponders'); similarly, in I. Chr.

---

1) The next division consists of 'anterior' dittograms; see below, Page.

15/16 (e n d) removal of the dittographed letter from the beginning of the second word in the expression בְּקוֹל לְשִׂמְחָה, renders the construction normal, and gives good sense ('with the voice of joy'). In Amos. 9/3, from the beginning of the second term in the expression מִשָּׁם הַיָּם, and again from the beginning of the second term in מִשָּׁם מֵאֹיְבֵיהֶם, מ must be removed as a dittogram, inasmuch as the required meaning is 'the sea, there', and 'their enemies, there', respectively. From the beginning of the last term in Isa. 17/14, גּוֹרָל לְבוֹזְזֵינוּ, removal of the dittogram simplifies the expression ('the lot of those who plunder us') and brings it into conformity with what immediately precedes ('the portion of those who spoil us'). The context in Ex. 14/10 shows that the verb-form in the opening expression פַּרְעֹה הִקְרִיב must be intransitive, not factitive, and thus should be קָרַב, which gives the clause an appropriate meaning ('Pharaoh drew near'); similarly, at the close of Jer. 29/8, the Hiphil participle in the expression אַתֶּם מַחְלְמִים ('ye are causing to be dreamed') cannot be correct, and must be changed, through removal of the dittographed מ, to the Qal, חֹלְמִים, which gives suitable sense ('ye dream'). In Gen. 42/1, 2, יֵשׁ שֶׁבֶר should rather be יֵשׁ בַּר ('there is corn'); and in II. Sam. 7/2, removal of כ from the beginning of the last word in the expression מִי כְּעַמְּךָ כְּיִשְׂרָאֵל brings it into line with the parallel in I. Chr. 17/21 ('who is like thy people Israel?').

The copulative ו frequently appears as a posterior dittogram. See II. Kings 11/1, where even the Massoretes have noted the superfluous letter in the beginning of the verb in the expression אֵם אֲחַזְיָהוּ וְרָאֲתָה; when this is removed, the meaning becomes, 'the mother of Ahaziah saw'; Gen. 34/29, where ו is to be deleted as a dittogram from before the accusatival sign in the clause וַיָּבֹזּוּ וְאֵת כֹּל, so that the meaning may be obtained ('and they plundered everything'; Jud. 7/22, where the copulative ו now begin-

ning the third word in the expression אִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ וּבְכָל הַמַּחֲנֶה must be removed in order to obtain the requisite meaning ('each one against his fellow throughout the camp').

Cases in which י is a posterior dittogram appear in Isa. 10/8 for כִּי יֹאכַל read כִּי אָכַל (as in beginning of verse 13) Isa. 40/1 for עַמִּי יֹאמַר read עַמִּי אָמַר, Isa. 40/27, where the verb-form in the closing expression מִשְׁפָּטִי יַעֲבֹר should rather be עָבַר, to accord with the preceding clause and give the meaning 'my judgment hath passed away' ; in Num. 24/16, where the last term in the expression מַחֲזֵה שַׁדַּי יֶחֱזֶה should be חֹזֶה, to harmonise with other participles in the passage, and to make the clause signify 'seeing a vision of the Almighty'.

Somewhat numerous are the cases in which ה, posteriously dittographed, produces an abnormal use of the article, in being irregularly prefixed to an indefinite noun or adjective, or to a construct noun. Instances occur in I. Sam. 26/22, where the Massoretes have noted the transcriptional error in the clause הִנֵּה הַחֲנִית הַמֶּלֶךְ ('Behold, the spear of the King!') in Ex. 8/11 (verse 15 in Greek and English), where the article is not required before the second term (an indefinite noun) in the expression הָיְתָה הָרְוָחָה ('there was respite' ; Sept. γέγονεν ἀνάφυχις) ; in Ruth 3/14, where, similarly, the noun in the clause בָּאָה הָאִשָּׁה, should be indefinite ('a woman came, Sept. ἦλθε γύνη) ; in Jer. 6/20, where the attributive adjective in the expression קָנֶה הַטּוֹב should be undefined ('sweet cane'), like its noun. In II. Kings 25/4, the Note-line calls attention to the form הַלַּיְלָה which with the article (here dittographed from the preceding word) signifies 'to-night', while the context shows that the form should be לַיְלָה ('by night'). Considering the very limited use of the Article in the Psalms, it may be safe to regard the second term in the expression לַיהוָה הַיְשׁוּעָה ('to the Lord (belongeth) salvation') and לַיהוָה הַמְּלוּכָה ('to

the Lord (belongeth) dominion'), in Ps. 3/9 and Ps. 22/29 respectively, as instances of posterior dittography; and certainly, the second of the three words עוּרָה הַנֵּבֶל וְכִנּוֹר ('awaken harp and lyre'), in Ps. 57/8 and 108/2, is a case in point. Similarly, the first letter of הֶבַת in Gen. 17/17 should be deleted; and the article should be removed from הַשָּׂדֶה in Jud. 1/14, as the noun is definite ('a field', Sept. simply ἀγρόν); cf. the parallel passage in Jud. 15/19. Ps. 82/8 for הָאָרֶץ read עָרִיץ.

Of inadvertent repetitions, a limited class is formed by those in which a small word in the received text, where it is felt to be a disturbing factor, is really but the echo of a preceding syllable. An instance occurs in the first half of Prov. 16/16, where, by deleting the third word in the expression קְנֵה חָכְמָה מַה טּוֹב מִחָרוּץ ('To acquire wisdom—what is better than gold?') a smooth reading ('To acquire wisdom (is) better than gold') is obtained, in closer accord with the construction in the second half; similarly, in I. Kings 13/11, the last of the three words (reasonably marked with the querying Note-line) אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים הַיּוֹם ('the man of God, to-day') is decidedly irrelevant, and must be regarded as a transcriptional error. In the middle of Ps. 32/7, רָנֵּי is a disturbing iteration from the end of the preceding form תִּצְּרֵנִי ('thou shalt preserve me').

(b) Anterior Dittograms occur more rarely than those forming the posterior class; and in the case of single letters, it is chiefly ה and י, but sometimes מ, which are found thus reflected.

In Jer. 31/39, the Massoretes themselves have noted קוה הַמִּדָּה ('the line of measurement') as an instance; but attention might have been called to the somewhat unusual lengthened form of the second verb in Ps, 3/6 שָׁכַבְתִּי וָאִישָׁנָה הֱקִיצוֹתִי ('I lay down and slept; I awoke'), and to the grammatical irregularity in מַאֲכָלוֹ בְּרִיאָה ('his food is fat') at the

close of Hab. 1/16, where a masculine subject has a feminine predicate, through the reflex influence of the ה beginning the next verse. In Job. 1/1, the expression וְהָיָה הָאִישׁ, marked with the Note-line as abnormal, should rather be וַיְהִי הָאִישׁ ('and the man was'); in Gen. 31/52, the former of the two terms in עֵדָה הַמַּצֵּבָה ('the stone pillar (is) witness') should be עֵד, as in the clause immediately preceding. More numerous are the instances in which י at the beginning of a word has affected the form and the term immediately preceding. Thus, in Amos 8/11, דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה should rather be דְּבַר יְהוָה ('the word of the Lord') as in the next verse, and in 7/16; in Ps. 18/34 and its parallel II. Sam. 22/34, the noun-form in the expression עַל בָּמוֹתַי יַעֲמִידֵנִי should rather be simply בָּמוֹת, so as to give the sense ('He setteth me on heights'); in Ps. 116/19, the former of the two terms בְּתוֹכֵכִי יְרוּשָׁלָיִם ('in the midst of thee, O Jerusalem') may be read בְּתוֹכֵךְ, without affecting the grammer or sense. In Num. 9/20, the unusual conbination יָמִים מִסְפָּר should rather be יְמֵי מִסְפָּר ('days of number, i. e. few days'); see the normal construction in Ezek. 12/16 ('men of number'), Job 16/22 ('years of number'); and in Num. 31/29, the former of the two verb-forms in the expression מִמַּחֲצִיתָם תִּקְחוּ וְנָתַתָּה ('From their half shall ye take, and thou shalt give') must have originally been the singular תִּקַּח, as shown by the verb immediately following, and by this very form in the next verse. In Ps. 69/20, when נֶגְדְּךָ כֹּל is corrected, in accordance with the Syriac, into נֶגֶד כֹּל, the inappropriate statement in the latter part of the verse ('all mine adversaries (are) before thee') is changed into something more appropriate ('my dishonour (is) before all mine adversaries'). In II. Sam. 1/21, the second of the four consecutive words מָגֵן גִּבּוֹרִים מָגֵן שָׁאוּל should not be plural, but singular, viz. גִּבּוֹר, inasmuch as the whole verse refers to Saul alone; the expression, when amended, means 'the shield of a hero, the shield

of Saul'. From the end of the initial term יְשָׂשׂוּם in Isa. 35/1, as is now generally acknowledged by critics, ם must be removed, as a retrospective dittogram from the next word, and read as יָשִׂישׂוּ, making the whole clause mean 'wilderness and desert shall rejoice'; similarly, in Deut. 25/17, the suffix in בְּצֵאתְכֶם ('when ye went out') is wrongly plural, through the assumption of ם from the succeeding word, and should rather be singular, as required by the context. In the combination לַגּוֹיִם מֻרְחָק Isa. 5/26 the first form should not be plural, but an indefinite singular לְגוֹי ('a nation') as shown by the correlative pronoun (to it) and adject. and verb following in the same verse.

(c) Anterior dittograms of more than a single letter also occur. The Massoretes themselves have called attention to one in II. Sam. 13/33, where the second of the three forms כִּי אִם אַמְנוֹן is but a fragmentary anticipation of the first, and the resultant reading is 'because Ammon'. In the former half of Prov. 22/7, viz. עָשִׁיר בְּרָשִׁים יִמְשֹׁל, the middle term should not be plural, but singular (like the first), viz. בְּרָשׁ the resultant meaning is 'A rich man has power over a poor man'.

(d) Repetition of whole words.

Attention is claimed by cases in which a whole word has been inadvertently repeated[1]). Such instances have sometimes been pointed out (by the Massoretes, as in Ezek.

---

1) Entirely different, of course, is intentional repetition of the same word, either (a) for emphasis, as עָמֹק עָמֹק ('very deep') in Eccl. 7/24; קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ ('most holy') Isa. 6/3; מְאֹד מְאֹד ('very, very'), Gen. 7/19; גֵּבִים גֵּבִים ('ditches, ditches', 'nothing but ditches') II. Kings 3/16; אָנֹכִי אָנֹכִי הוּא מְנַחֲמְכֶם ('I am thy comforter') Isa. 51/12 etc.; or (b) to express distributive arrangement, as שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם ('two by two') Gen. 7/9; יוֹם יוֹם ('daily') Ex. 16/5; גּוֹי גּוֹי ('each nation by itself'). II. Kings 17/29; see also Isa. 21/9; 26/3; 38/9; Deut. 2/27; 16/20.

48/16, where the second חמש ('five') is marked as superfluous, and in Jer. 51/3, where the second יִדְרֹךְ ('tread') is similarly indicated; at other times, the Note-line has been inserted, as in Num. 17/29, where this mark is prefixed to the second הַקָּרֵב; in Lam. 1/16, where the second עֵינִי is similarly noted; at the beginning of Ps. 45/5, וַהֲדָרְךָ ('and thy majesty') is marked as a disturbing echo from the end of the preceding verse. In other cases, however, no mark has been made at the needlessly repeated word; thus בָּא בָּא ('it cometh') in Jer. 46/20; הַנַּעַר הַנַּעַר ('the young men') in II. Kings 9/4; אַחֶיךָ אַחֶיךָ ('thy brethern'). Repetition of two words occurs in Ps. 96/13, where one of the two pairs כִּי בָא כִּי בָא ('for He cometh') seems enough.

Unnecessary and disturbing repetition, in the Massoretic text, of several words appears in II. Kings 7/13, where the clause beginning with the first אֲשֶׁר and ending with יִשְׂרָאֵל before the second אֲשֶׁר forms a needless duplication. In Ezek. 40/8, the last three words, together with the first four in the beginning of the next verse (from מֵהַבַּיִת down to הַשַּׁעַר inclusive) should be removed, as an unnecessary repetition of what previously occurs at the end of verse 7 and the beginning of verse 8. The last word in II. Sam. 6/3, together with the first words in verse 4 (viz. from חֲדָשָׁה down to בַּגִּבְעָה; both inclusive) forms an unconscious duplication, by an ancient scribe, from the middle of verse 3. I. Chr. 9/35; 44 (ten verses) is a duplication of 8/29; 38. In the middle of Lev. 14/8, there is needless repetition (as indicated by the insertion of the Note-line) of the expression 'the living bird', which is found at the beginning. In Num. 3/3, at the beginning there is unnecessary repetition, from verse 2, of the words 'These are the sons of Aaron'. Ps. 118/11 seems a superfluous repetition of verse 10; moreover, the latter half of verse 12 is unnecessarily repeated.

(e) Conflate Readings.

Attention may next conveniently be given to Conflate Readings, now occurring in the Received Hebrew Text, which are distinguished from those already considered by peculiar features. (a) Conflates are not mere repetitions of the self-same word or words, but exhibit differences, less or greater, in form and sound, one from the other. (b) These associated forms have not been unconsciously penned by transcribers, but have been intentionally conjoined.

The primary cause of conflate readings is deviation from the original text by early transcribers, who substituted a resemblant but wrong reading for the correct form; subsequent transcribers, though perceiving that a mistake had been made by their predecessors, and that the form before them was unsuitable, or even impracticable, did not venture on summarily setting this aside and substituting what they deemed the correct reading, but rather allowed the erroneous form to remain, and a d d e d what they judged to be the genuine form,—the attention of subsequent readers being sometimes called to the combination through an inserted Note-line. Alternately, Conflate Readings may be regarded as resulting from the action of a later scribe, who, finding divergent readings in two or more MSS. from which he was making a new copy, preserved in this both the improbable and the probable readings, but did not venture on exercising his own judgment in selecting and transmitting only one. As a rule, the wrong reading is given first, and the corrected form next,—sometimes with the copulative ו prefixed—occasionally, however, this order is reversed. Intelligent readers of the Massoretic Text will thus understand that when Conflate Readings are met with, the wrong form is to be set aside and the correct form preferred.

In Mal. 3/5, announcing divine retribution to fall on

the oppressors of the hireling, the widow, and the fatherless, it is to be borne in mind that the verb employed in this connection applies only to p e r s o n s, not things (see Deut. 24/14 ; Zach. 7/10 ; Ps. 119/121, 122 ; Prov. 14/31 ; 22/16 etc.); yet the reading in the Massoretic Text here is עֹשְׁקֵי שְׂכַר שָׂכִיר ('those who oppress the hire of the hireling'),—a difficulty which some have endeavoured to surmount by the rendering, 'those who oppress the hireling (in his) wages' ; the right course, however, is to regard שכר as an incorrect form of שָׂכִיר, with which it has been unwisely retained. Again, when we read in Mal. 2/11, that 'Judah hath acted deceitfully, and an abomination hath been committed in Israel and in Jerusalem', historical fact compels us to regard the form בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, which is quite out of place here, as having been inadvertently substituted, by an early transcriber, for בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם, which a later copyist recognised as the correct reading, and appended, with ו conjoining the two. The expression אִם בֹּא יָבֹא, at the beginning of Lev. 14/48, in the enactments regarding the removal of leprosy from infected houses, obviously contains conflate readings ; the context does not require emphasis such as is indicated by the Massoretic reading ('If the priest actually goes in'), but בֹּא may rather be regarded as an early mistranscribed form unwisely retained with the correct form following. In Jeremiah's entreaty that the Lord would take vengeance on the foes of his people, a reason, as given in the Massoretic Text, 10/25 אָכְלוּ אֶת יַעֲקֹב וַאֲכָלֻהוּ וַיְכַלֻּהוּ ('they have devoured Jacob, and eaten him, and consumed him'); obviously, an early transcriber has been influenced by the first verb-form to mis-write the second, but a later scribe, though perceiving the error of his predecessor, has retained this, and added the correct form. In the law prohibiting usury, Ex. 22/24, a strange reading, marked by the Note-line, is represented in the Massoretic Text, after the opening words,

'If thou will lend'; the object of the verb is thus somewhat clumsily defined, אֶת עַמִּי אֶת הֶעָנִי עִמָּךְ ('my people, the one who is in distress with thee'); if the former part of this expression ('my people' not represented in the Septuagint except by the evasive 'thy brother' be regarded as merely a transcriptional error, followed by the correct reading, the sentence may be read smoothly. Of the two resemblant pairs in כִּי נִרְאָה כִּי נִלְאָה ('when he appeareth, when he wearied') in the Massoretic Text of Isa. 16/12 the first may (with Duhm, Bort, Cheyne and others) safely be regarded as an unwisely retained mistranscription of the second, when it is omitted, the verse runs freely ('And it shall come to pass, when Moab is wearied on the high place...') Another obvious instance of the conflate readings occurs in Job 20/17, where the first and second terms in the expression נַחֲרֵי נַחֲלֵי דְבַשׁ ('rivers of streams of honey') are utterly inconsistent: as נהר applies to a large and full flowing 'river' (such as the Euphrates), while נַחַל signifies a small stream, or temporary torrent (such as the Kidron) the former here must be regarded as a transcriptional error, retained with the correct form following. A similar instance appears in the announcement of divine judgment at the beginning of Ezek. 5/14; cf. the three words אֶתְּנֵךְ לְחָרְבָּה וּלְחֶרְפָּה ('I will make thee a desolation and a reproach'), the second of which is a scribal error, while the third is the correct form (see the next verse), with ו prefixed. Further, when examination is made of the words at the beginning of Josh. 6/7, viz וִיְרִיחוֹ סֹגֶרֶת וּמְסֻגֶּרֶת ('Now Jericho (was) shutting up and shut up'), it becomes evident that the first participial form, transitive in sense, is devoid of an object, and must have been wrongly transcribed by an early copyist; a later scribe retained it, but added the correct form, with the copulative ו prefixed. If the former of the two similar pairs of words וְאָמַר אֶפֶס וְאָמַר הַס

('and he shall say, Nothing, and he shall say, Hush') in Amos 6/10, be retained, as given by the Massoretes, difficulty in expounding this whole passage, otherwise obscure enough, is only intensified; but considerable relief results when the second pair alone is retained, as the correct reading.

A notable passage, marked by the Note-line, in which the Massoretes have presented conflate readings yet have failed to perceive the correct forms after all, is Deut. 17/8, showing what was to be done by judges in deciding difficult cases of controversy between disputants; the dispute is described in the Massoretic Text as בֵּין דָּם לְדָם בֵּין דִּין לְדִין ('between blood and blood, and between dispute and dispute'); but the controversies are not carried on by things but by p e r s o n s, the correct reading can be neither of the alternatives preserved in the current Hebrew text, but rather בֵּין דָּן לְדָן ('between one disputant and another'); accordingly, what follows in the received text must also be corrected so as to exhibit participles describing persons, thus: וּבֵין נֹגֵעַ לְנֹגֵעַ דּוֹבְרֵי רִיבוֹת ('and between one smiter and another, declaring disputes').

Conflate readings sometimes are contained within a single form. Thus, in II. Sam. 1/26, נִפְלְאַתָה should normally be נִפְלְאָה ('was wonderful'), as the Niphal of פָּלָא, but an early copyist, taking the root to be פָּלַה, wrote נִפְלָהָה, while a later transcriber c o m b i n e d these two Niphal forms into that which has been set before us by the Massoretes.

To a word bearing a meaning quite suited to its context, addition has sometimes been made of a single letter, different from any other near at hand, with the result that there is produced another word wholly unsuited in meaning to its surroundings. Thus in Isa. 9/19 depicting a severe famine in which man would seize and

devour the flesh of 'his friend', the appropriate original form רֵעוֹ has been mistranscribed into זְרוֹעוֹ ('his (own) arm'), —a corruption which had established itself even before the Septuagint Translation was made. In Isa. 10/3 (near end) תַּעַזְבוּ should be תָּעִיזוּ ('ye shall hastily carry off', to put in a safe place,—not 'leave'). In Ps. 68/17, for תִּרְצְדוּן (addressed wrongly to the mountains) read תִּרְעוּ ב (addressed to people) 'why do ye delight in?'. In the parallel clause following חָמַד occurs.

Rarely does the incorrect form follow the correct reading, as in Jud. 20/38, when last of the three words עִם הָאֹרֵב הֵרֵב has been unwisely retained, to the annoyance of expositors, after the first two, which give all the meaning (viz. 'with the men in ambush') required in the sentence. In reply to David, who asked bread for himself and his men, the Massoretic Text of I. Sam. 21/5 represents Abimelech as saying אֵין לֶחֶם חֹל אֶל־תַּחַת יָדִי; but the fourth word here (אֶל) is rightly to be regarded as a corrupt form of that which precedes, and must accordingly be omitted, to make good sense ('There is no common bread under my hand'). Of the two adjoining words וְאָמַר אֲשֶׁר in Zach. 13/6, the second may reasonably be regarded as an erroneous conflate, and conveniently omitted.

Misleading insertion has sometimes been made, within a word, of a single letter similar to that which precedes or follows; thus, in Ps. 22/27, לְבַבְכֶם ('your heart') should be לְבָבָם ('their heart'); In Nah. 3/18, יִשְׁכְּנוּ ('they dwell') is a transcriptional error for יָשְׁנוּ ('they are asleep') as proved by the correlative verb-form נָמוּ ('they slumber') in the clause preceding. In Jer. 2/34, בִּכְנָפַיִךְ ('in thy skirts') should rather be בְּכַפַּיִךְ ('in thy hands') as indicated in the Syriac and the Septuagint (ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου). In Ps. 68/5 instead of the unsuitable form בַּעֲרָבוֹת ('in the deserts') read בֶּעָבוֹת ('in the dark clouds').

Substitution has sometimes been made of similarly

sounded words (aural mistakes of copyists). Many errors of this kind occur in Psalm 68th.

In Ps. 68/5, instead of the unsuitable imperative סלו ('raise high') read צַהֲלוּ ('shout joyfully').

(f) Explanatory Notes, or Glosses. Additions to the original Hebrew text have occasionally been made at points where a transcriber deemed explanation necessary; these 'Glosses', however, are less numerous than appear to some expositors, who reject, as editorial insertions, many troublesome words or expressions presenting difficulties which, after all, may be solved after patient consideration.

Explanatory additions of single words, similar in meaning but different in form, appear in Ex. 38/9, where the last term in the expression לִפְאַת נֶגֶב תֵּימָנָה ('on the south side, southward'), marked by the Note-line, must have been regarded by the inserting scribe as a necessary explanation of what precedes (see also 26/18) similarly in the expression לִפְאַת קֵדְמָה מִזְרָחָה ('to the east side, eastward'), Ex. 38/13; Num. 2/3, the last term may by us be deemed a needless explanatory addition, but must have been differently regarded by the later scribe who appended it to what had in his days perhaps become an obsolete word.

When two or more words in a passage give some reason for suspecting that these may have been inserted later, it may not be possible to reach a definite conclusion; each case must be considered carefully, and there may be all degrees of probability; obvious redundancy, however, will prove a strong determinant. Many explanations which can hardly be deemed necessary appear in the Book of Joshua; thus, 1/4, ('the great river', Euphrates); 1/2, (a t e n d) 'to them', (to the children of Israel), (not found in the Septuagint); 3/16 'the sea of the Arabah' (the sea of Salt); 2/3, 'who came to thee' (who came to thy house). Other amplifications in the same Book have produced bad

grammar; see 3/14 'the ark (of the covenant)'; 3/17 'the ark (of the covenant of the Lord)'; 3/11, 'the ark of the covenant (of the Lord of all the earth)'; 8/11 'and all the people (of war)'. In the Book of Jeremiah, similar additions appear; thus 1/14, 'Behold, I will feed them (this people)'; 32/8, 'in Anathoth (which is the country of Benjamin)'; 34/12, 'the word of the Lord to Jeremiah (from the Lord)'. See also I. Sam. 28/3, 'in Ramah (and in his own city)'; and the expression 'the God of their fathers' inserted in the middle of Gen. 31/53. In Ex. 22/30, the middle word of the expression וּבָשָׂר בַּשָּׂדֶה טְרֵפָה has been inconsiderately inserted by a scribe, mentally influenced by the form of the preceding resemblant; for the addition ('in the field') is not represented in the Old Versions, nor does it occur in any other of the passages where טְרֵפָה appears (Gen. 31/39; Ex. 22/12; Lev. 7/24; 17/15; 22/8 etc.) the correct reading here, accordingly is וּבָשָׂר הַטְּרֵפָה ('and the flesh of what has been torn' by ravenous beasts). Isa. 7/17 end; omit 'the King of Assyria'; also, at beginning of next verse, omit 'and it shall come to pass' (see the Note-line). Isa. 7/20 'by the King of Assyria' is a late addition.

Somewhat different are larger additions which cannot be regarded as explanatory, but must rather be viewed as extraneous matter showing little or no affinity to the context. Such a passage appears at the end of Zach. 6/15; 'And it shall come to pass, if ye will diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord your God',—an irrelevant fragment more in the style of Deuteronomy than in that of Zachariah. Another instance is the last verse of Ps. 25, in its received form; the genuine text (verses 1-21) — the prayer of an i n d i v i d u a l for deliverance from distress—is evidently an acrostic composition in which every letter of the Hebrew Alphabet, from א to ת except ק and ד, begins each successive verse; but after the completion of the series in verse 21,

there has been added, by a later hand, another verse of a different character, 'Redeem Israel, O God, from all his troubles'.

11. FUSION OF FORMS.

Fusion of two adjacent words into one has produced a considerable number of errors in the Massoretic Text; such mistakes, obviously, might easily be made when there was no dividing point or sufficient space between words in the copy from which a transcriber executed his work[1]. In the process, a weak vowel-letter, or even a fairly strong consonant, has usually been eliminated, and other modifications have taken place. The converse restoration of the original reading frequently demands patient study, but payment of this price often brings rich reward.

In Ezek. 8/6, the Massoretes themselves have indicated in a marginal note that מהם is a transcriptional error for מָה הֵם ('what are they?'); similarly, in Gen. 30/11, they mark בגד as an error for בָּא גָּד ('fortune hath come'); in Isa. 3/15, מַלְכֶם should be מַה לָּכֶם, as indicated by the Massoretes themselves. In Num. 12/6, the form נְבִיאֶכֶם ('your prophet'), which does not suit the context, must be a contraction of נָבִיא בָּכֶם ('a prophet among you'), which makes smooth reading; and in 23/10, the unsuitable form וּמִסְפָּר ('and number') is shown by the Septuagint (καὶ τίς ἐξαριθμήσεται) to be a transcriptional error for וּמִי יִסְפֹּר ('and who can count?'). At the beginning of Jer. 3/1, the form לֵאמֹר ('saying') is obviously objectionable and must originally have been לֵךְ אֱמֹר ('Go say'); and in the middle of Jer. 44/14, for form וְלָשׁוּב ('And to return'), properly marked with the Note-line as unsuitable, should be וְלֹא יָשׁוּבוּ ('neither shall

---

1) See remarks already made on page 149.

they return'). The description, in the Massoretic Text of Job 24/14, of the murderer as rising 'with the daylight' to commit his crimes, cannot be accepted as correct; but when לָאוֹר with which a Note-line has rightly been associated, is altered so as to become לֹא אוֹר ('while there is still no light'), the difficulty disappears. In Josh. 15/19 and its parallel Jud. 1/15, נָתַתָּנִי is obviously a mistranscription of נָתַתָּ לִי ('thou hast given to me'). In Ps. 68/34, הֵן יִתֵּן בְּקוֹלוֹ should rather be הֵן יִתֵּן לִמְקוֹוֵה לוֹ ('favour he will give to one who waits expectantly to'). In Ps. 73/1 טוֹב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל should rather be טוֹב לְיָשָׁר אֵל ('God is good to an upright man'), as already perceived by other critics. Ps. 3/3 for the awkward form יְשׁוּעָתָה read יְשׁוּעָה עַתָּה ('There is no help now').

In several passages obviously presenting conditional sentences of a purely hypothetical character, beginning with לוּ or לוּלֵי and ordinarily requiring כִּי עַתָּה ('certainly now') to introduce the apodosis, this reading should be restored instead of the amalgam כְּמַעַט ('soon') in the received text; see Isa. 1/9; Ps. 81/15. Anything but a satisfactory and suitable meaning is afforded in Num. 27/14 by the Massoretic form לְהַקְדִּישֵׁנִי ('to sanctify me'); the Old Versions, however, (Septuagint, οὐχ ἡγιάσατέ με, Lat. nec sanctificare me voluisti, and similarly the Peshito) show that the correct reading was לֹא הִקְדַּשְׁתֶּנִי ('ye did not sanctify me'). The last two words of Ex. 5/16, viz. וְחַטָּאת עַמֶּךָ, forming part of the complaint of the oppressed Israelites to Pharaoh, cannot be defended as good grammar or good sense; but if the clause be recast in the form וְהַחֵטא אֶת עַמֶּךָ ('but the fault (is) with thine own people') every difficulty disappears[1]. The last clause of Isa. 40/21 ('Have ye not understood (or 'perceived') the foundations of the earth?'), hardly commends itself as satisfactory, inasmuch as the context points to

---

1) See another explanation suggested on page

perception of God himself, as the founder; but, if what is given by the Massoretes as the object in the sentence, viz. מוֹסְדוֹת הָאָרֶץ, be viewed as a mistranscription of the resemblant מִי יָסַד אֶת הָאָרֶץ ('who hath founded the earth?'), this may safely be accepted as correct. The presence of the Note-line at the beginning of Ps. 55/22 shows that grammatical and other difficulties have long been recognised; but if the second form in the Massoretic reading חָלְקוּ מַחֲמָאוֹת פִּיו be regarded as a fusion of two separate words, viz. מְחֻמְאָה אִמְרוֹת, an acceptable meaning is secured ('smoother than curd (were) the words of his mouth').

A more reasonable reading than לִשְׁבֹּר in Gen. 42/5 is לְהָשִׁיב בָּר ('to bring back grain'), and the same change is required in verses 8 and 10; we may then venture on changing the imperative וְשִׁבְרוּ into וְהָשִׁיבוּ בָר ('and bring back grain'); on the other hand the Hiphil participle הַמַּשְׁבִּיר, applied in verse 6 to Joseph, the administrator of food-supplies in Egypt, is probably a fused form of הַמֹּשֵׁךְ בָּר ('the one who drew out grain' from the stores); and this view is confirmed by Prov. 11/26, in which the first clause, opposing the second (containing the faulty form מַשְׁבִּיר instead of מֹשֵׁךְ בָּר), mentions one who withholds grain. A most ingenious suggestion has been made by Ball, that in Gen. 47/24 וּלְאָכְלְכֶם ('and for your eating') is a fusion of וּלְאֹכֶל לָכֶם ('and for food to yourselves'). The unworkable form הִמּוֹל, in Exod. 12/48, must have originally been אִם יִמּוֹל which makes the clause run smoothly thus, 'if every male be circumcised by him. . .' Change of the questionable form עֲצָבוֹ, in I. Kings 1/6, to the more probable עָצַר בּוֹ gives the appropriate statement regarding Adonijah that David 'his father had not restrained him' at any time. In Ex. 15/16 אֵימָתָה should rather be אִימָה עַתָּה (fear now); see Isa. 5/24, כֶּאֱכֹל, which produces an unsatisfactory construction, כַּאֲשֶׁר יֹאכַל is a smoother and more prob-

able reading ('As stubble is devoured'). In Isa. 40/4, the form הָרְכָסִים is n o t a single noun (hitherto unexplained by lexicographers) with the article prefixed, but t w o nouns amalgamated (the second of which was rare and became obsolete) viz. הַר עֲקַשִּׁים ('a mount of perversions,—i. e. obstacles or impediments), is required to give a meaning contracted with that of the noun following (בִּקְעָה, a wide and open plain). The abnormal form יְשׁוּעָתָה in Ps. 3/3 was doubtless originally יְשׁוּעָה עַתָּה ('Salvation now'); a similar change seems required in Ps. 80/3; Jon. 2/10. Earlier critics have observed that אָכְלוּ ('they eat') in Ps. 22/30 is an error for אַךְ לוֹ ('Verily, to him'), and that יוֹמָם ('by day') in Ps. 13/3 should rather be יוֹם יוֹם ('daily'). In Joel 1/16 שִׂמְחָה ('joy') should be שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה ('the oil for anointing'); and in Zach. 11/8 וָאַכְחִיד is a transcriptional error for וָאַךְ בְּאַחַד ('and I smote with one' (rod). Ps. 44/27 עֶזְרָתָה should read עָזֹר עָתָה Ps. 65/6 the unworkable נוֹרָאוֹת (fitly marked by the Note-line) should be נוֹרָא אַתָּה 'dreadful (art) thou'.

12. DIATOMY.

Another transcriptional error, the antithesis of fusion, is diatomy of one word into two parts, and the formation of these either simply or with slight modification, into two separate words.

An instance has been noted by the Massoretes themselves in Jud. 16/25 where כִּי טוֹב should be כְּטוֹב; similar instances which they have not marked occur in Ezek. 7/4, where כִּי דְרָכַיִךְ ('for thy ways') should be כִּדְרָכַיִךְ ('according to thy ways'), as in verses 3 and 8; see also Job. 8/9; 34/11. The Note-line marks the expression כִּי אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה in Josh. 5/6 to show that historical fact requires the reading

to be כְּאַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה ('about forty years'); attention is similarly called, in Isa. 60/9, to כִּי לִי ('For, to me'),which should rather be the construct plural form כְּלֵי ('vessels', i. e. 'ships'; see the context). In Isa. 15/5, כִּי מַעֲלֵה ('also marked by the Note-line') should rather be בְּמַעֲלֵה ('in the ascent'), and for כִּי דֶרֶךְ we must read בְּדֶרֶךְ ('in the way'); in Isa. 26/12, גַּם כָּל מַעֲשֵׂינוּ should rather be גְּמוּל מַעֲשֵׂינוּ ('the recompense of our deeds'). Hesitation may well be felt in accepting the unqualified statement at the end of Ps. 7/12, אֵל זֹעֵם בְּכָל יוֹם ('God is wroth every day'), hence the explanatory addition in the English Versions, 'with the wicked'; but the two closing forms may be reasonably regarded as a mistranscription of מַכְלִים, which makes the whole clause mean, 'God is wroth with an insulter'. The impracticable reading בָּם יְשָׁרִים in Ps. 49/15 must rather be בְּמֵשָׁרִים ('in righteousness' i. e. justly'), as at the close of Ps. 9/9. The appropriate close of Ps. 59/9, כִּי מִי שׁוֹמֵעַ ('for who heareth?') should rather be the resemblant בִּימֵי שִׂבַע ('in days of satiety'). The repeated expression מִי יָגוּר לָנוּ in Isa. 33/14, where the inserted Note-line marks it as a difficulty felt long ago by transcribers, is best amended as מָגוֹר לָנוּ ('our fear is'). The unsatisfactory reading אַךְ זֶה חֳלִי ('verily, this (is) a disease'), in Jer. 10/19, is best corrected in the form אַכְזָר חֳלִיִּי ('cruel (is) my disease'), which comes into line with the previous part of the verse. The unique and questionable form חַרְצֻבוֹת in Ps. 73/4 is preferably to be read as חֶרֶד עֲצָבוֹת, so that the whole clause may be rendered 'there is no one dreading pangs in their death'.

13. ASSIMILATION OF CONTIGUOUS RESEMBLANTS.

When two, words essentially different in meaning, but similar in form, occur in nearsuccession, it is only too easy for a transcriber, when he has reached the second, to make

this still more like, or even identical with, the first; special attention, indeed, is required to combat the subtle psychological influence constraining the scribe unconsciously to assimilate the two. Careful examination of some passages in the Received Text tends to the conclusion that this mistaken identification has taken place in early times, even before the execution of the Septuagint Version, which frequently but conforms to the Massoretic reading.

Part of Ps. 39/2 runs thus, according to the Massoretic Text; 'I will keep my ways, nor to sin with my tongue; I will keep a bridle for my mouth'; but the recurrence of precisely the same verb-form אֶשְׁמְרָה in the second line as in the first is contrary to the principles of parallelism, which demands variation, while the Septuagint rendering ἐθέμην points to אָשִׁיתָה ('I will put') as the original reading. The Massoretic Text of I. Kings 1/18 exhibits the form וְעַתָּה at the beginning of b o t h parts, and gives the bald but questionable meaning 'And now, behold Adonijah reigneth; and now my lord O King, thou knowest (it) not'; at the beginning of the s e c o n d clause, however, the Septuagint rendering καὶ σύ shows that the Hebrew there was originally וְאַתָּה, which, when restored, produces a circumstantial clause, giving an entirely appropriate sense ('though thou, my lord O King, knoweth (it) not'). The second בָּטַחוּ ('they trusteth') in Ps. 22/5 should rather be הִבִּיטוּ ('they looked'). The second הָרִימִי (transitive in sense) in Isa. 40/9 should rather be the i n t r a n s i t i v e הָרִיעִי ('shout'), as it has no c o m p l e t i n g a c c u s a t i v e. Ps. 76/8 the opening אַתָּה should rather be עַתָּה ('now'). In the Received Text of Zach. 8/5, the opening and closing terms present a jarring tautology; 'The open spaces of the city (Jerusalem) shall be full of lads and lasses playing in its open spaces'; by retaining the initial form רְחֹבוֹת, however, and substituting the resemblant בַּחֻרוֹת as the correct form at the end, an

entirely suitable sense ('in groups', or 'in companies') is secured there. Among other textual difficulties in Ps. 10/9, which describes the unprincipled treatment of the poor and weak by the cruelly selfish, the repetition of the very same form יֶאֱרֹב in two closely consecutive clauses is quite opposed to the rules of parallelism; most probably, therefore, what is now the repeated form in the second clause was originally יַאֲרִיךְ, but this was unconsciously assimilated to the opening term by an early transcriber. On the reasonable assumption that this actually occurred, the amended text will give the following sense, 'He lieth in wait secretly at a distance like a lion in its lair; he waiteth long, to seize the feeble poor'. Isa. 5/14 לָכֵן (assimilated from beginning of verse 13) should rather be לָהֶם ('for them').

N. B. In Isa. 40/9, 10, cf. the 3 times הִנֵּה, the first should probably be חִנּוּן ('kind'), the second (beginning of 10) retained, but the t h i r d (middle of 10) should probably be הֵנָּה ('h i t h e r') and a t t a c h e d t o w h a t p r e c e d e s.

Ps. 77/9 for גָּמַר אֹמֶר read גָּמַר אֱמֶת (or אַמְּתוֹ). In Joel 1/10, the second שֻׁדַּד should rather be שֻׁדַּף (or שָׁדֵף), as such a term is elsewhere (Gen. 41/6, 23, 27) used to express the blasting of growing grain; here, however, a transcriber has mechanically repeated the opening form. Of the two forms in the expression קוּמוּ וְנָקוּמָה ('arise ye, and let us arise') now appearing in Obad. 1, the second has certainly been assimilated to the first, either from an original וְנָקֻוָּה, or more probably from וְנִקָּרְבָה, either of which, together with the first (meaning 'Arise ye, and let us gather together', or 'Arise ye, and let us advance'), would form a suitable summons, to attack Edom. In Jer. 23/2, forming part of the Lord's message to regardless rulers, these are described as הָרֹעִים הָרֹעִים אֶת עַמִּי ('the shepherds who shepherd my people'); but as the second form here, identical with the first,

should be expected, like others in the context, rather to indicate harshness of treatment, it may safely be regarded as having been inadvertently substituted for הָרֹצְצִים, which would give a meaning suited to the whole clause ('the shepherds who oppress my people'). The expression לֹא אֶשְׁמַע, in Ps. 38/14, should be לֹא יִשְׁמַע ('that heareth not') as shown in the correlative clause succeeding. In II. Sam. 1/24 of the two consecutive words, יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל, the second should be עַל ('over'). Influenced through having written פָּקְדִי עָלָיו ('my visiting upon him') at the beginning of Amos 3/14, a transcriber has further on mistakenly substituted וּפָקַדְתִּי עַל מִזְבְּחוֹת for וּפִרַקְתִּי כָּל מַצְּבוֹת ('I shall break all the stone pillars').

Comparatively rare are cases of p r o s p e c t i v e assimilation, in which a transcriber, viewing in advance a form resembling another which he was about to copy, unconsciously assimilated the preceding to the succeeding; thus, what the Massoretic Text now presents as the first term (marked by the Note-line as a questionable reading) in the expression בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ ('O house of Israel and house of the King') in Hos. 5/1, has been mistakenly written, through the reflex influence of the second בֵּית, instead of בְּנֵי (see the correct reading, 'children of Israel', in 2/1 and 2; 2/4). Ps. 36/10 for אוֹר ('at end') put אוֹרַח ('a way') (ח being omitted). Ps. 38/12 for יַעֲמְדוּ, read מָעֲדוּ ('have become unreliable') (through the influence of the closing form). Ps. 77/9 for לָנֶצַח חַסְדּוֹ read לְנֵצַח חַסְדּוֹ (see Ex. 34/7 'to c o n t i n u e his loving kindness'). Josh. 2/8 עַל (עֲלֵיהֶם) עָלְתָה read אֲלֵיהֶם.

14. ABBREVIATIONS AS CAUSES OF ERROR IN TRANSCRIPTION.

Abbreviations of various kinds have proved a considerable source of error in transcription of the Hebrew

Text[1] To economise the space of the inscribed surface as to spare the time and patience of the transcriber, familiar words and grammatical terminations, instead of being fully written out, have sometimes been represented by fragments of the whole, or by condensed forms; but these have occasionally been misunderstood by later transcribers, who have thus transmitted a faulty text.

Thus, the Tetragrammadion יהוה, even now sometimes represented by יי, must have occasionally been indicated by a single י, which was apt to be misunderstood by a later scribe. In Ex. 8/23, the Septuagint translator shows that he read the second of the two forms, כַּאֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר, as יְהוָה אָמַר (καθάπερ εἶπε Κύριος LXX. 8/27); similarly, in Jon. 1/9, the first of the two words in the prophet's answer עִבְרִי אָנֹכִי ('I am a Hebrew'), has been misread by the Greek Translator as עֶבֶד יְהוָה (δοῦλος Κυρίου ειμὶ ἐγώ); and conversely, in Jer. 6/11, חֲמַת יְהוָה ('the wrath of the Lord') was read by the Greek translator as חֲמָתִי (τὸν θυμόν μου).

Attention is called by means of the Note-line in Josh. 22/16 to the unusual expression in עֲדַת יְהוָה ('the congregation of the Lord'), repeated in verse 17, because the normal combination is (see verses 12, 18) עֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל ('the congregation of Israel'); the abnormal expression has most probably arisen through the misreading of an abbreviated form, which was deemed to represent 'Jehovah' rather than 'Israel'. The Massoretic Text in the first part of Prov. 13/13 is בָּז לְדָבָר יֵחָבֵל; but as this both gives a vague beginning and presents an awkward impersonal construction afterwards ('(As for) him who despises a word,—he shall be ruined'), it seems best to reconstruct the whole thus בָּז לִדְבַר יְהוָה חֻבַּל לוֹ ('(As for) him who despises the word of the Lord,—there

---

1) See the illuminating remarks of Perles *Analekten zur Textkritik Alten Testaments* (München, 1895, pp. 4 1f.).

is ruin for him'). At the close of II. Chr. 21/2, in the Massoretic Text, Jehoshaphat is incorrectly designed 'King of Israel', instead of 'King of Judah', probably because a scribe unwittingly misread an abbreviation of the closing term; the Septuagint, however, presents the correct reading; similarly, in II. Chr. 28/19, Ahaz also is wrongly designated King of Israel'. An early copyist, in writing out Zach. 12/1, has, for 'Jerusalem', of which the whole chapter mainly treats, inadvertently substituted 'Israel', doubtless influenced by an abbreviation, liable to be misread, in the text he transcribed. In Hos. 10/15, a better reading than the Massoretic בֵּית אֵל ('Bethel') seems to be preserved in the corresponding Septuagint rendering οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, i. e. בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל ('O house of Israel')[1].

The final ם of the plur. masculine ending was sometimes omitted, as is commonly done in modern Hebrew; an instance noted by the Massoretes themselves is הַחִצִי in I. Sam. 20/38 for הַחִצִים ('the arrows'); in Isa. 38/12, רֹעִי ('my shepherd') should be רֹעִים ('shepherds'); in Ps. 144/2, a more suitable reading than עַמִּי is עַמִּים ('peoples'). In Jon. 1/16, the singular form הַחֹבֵל instead of the plural ('the sailors') which is rather to be expected, may be due to the fuller omission of ים from the end of the word.

15. COMPLICATED CASES.

After having considered, separately, the different ways in which transcriptional errors have crept into the Massoretic Text, one may be fairly well prepared to consider cases in which two or more aberrations have occurred, and to solve the difficulties in such complicated instances.

---

[1] In many Manuscripts, such contractions as a ישר׳ for ישראל, אלהי׳ for אלהים, a שבע׳ for שבעתי occur.

The Received Hebrew in Joel 1/7 presents the impossible reading וְהִשְׁלִיךְ ('and threw (it) away'),—for the locusts neither could nor would throw away the branches they had bared; a copyist evidently misread the correct reading וְכַשֶּׁלֶג ('and like snow') which refers to the white appearance of the branches when stripped of their bark. In Ps. 27/6, בְּאָהֳלוֹ ('in his tent') must surely be a mistranscription of the resemblant לֵאלֹהַי ('to my God'). Jer. 48/2 now exhibits too mild a term in תֵּלֵךְ ('will go') when mention is made of the sword 'pursuing' the Moabites; the correct reading is the resemblant form תִּדְלַק (see Gen. 31/36; I. Sam. 17/53; Lam. 4/19). Ps. 31/10 (end) presents a combination ('my soul and my belly') so remarkable that one may well be excused for thinking that something must be wrong with the Received Text; but if, for the closing term וּבִטְנִי, substitution be made of וּבְשָׂרִי ('and my flesh'), reasonable objection disappears. In Ps. 31/14, where, according to the Received Text, the writer declares that he heard 'the slander of many', the context shows that he was in serious danger from something worse than evil speaking; but by changing דִּבַּת רַבִּים into זִמַּת אֹרְבִים ('the wicked plotting of those lying in wait') a more appropriate thought is obtained. In Ezek. 8/11 the unique form וְעָתַר, which cannot be associated in meaning with other forms exhibiting the same radicals, is most reasonably to be regarded as a mistranscription of וְעָשָׁן, which, when substituted, enables us satisfactorily to render the whole of the circumstantial clause which it begins ('while the smoke of the cloud of incense ascended'). In Ps. 22/27, instead of the two verb-forms יֹאכְלוּ וְיִשְׂבָּעוּ ('let them eat and be satisfied') which surely give a meaning too grossly corporeal to suit the context, the resemblants יָגִילוּ וְיִשְׂמָחוּ ('let them exult and be glad') may more fitly be substituted. Assent should readily be given in Isa. 38/17 to the change of the verb-form חָשַׁקְתָּ ('thou hast loved') to the resemblant חָשַׂכְתָּ, in

order to secure for the whole clause the appropriate meaning 'thou hast preserved my soul from the pit'. In the latter half of Ps. 32/8, retention of the received verb-form אִיעָצָה compels interpreters to adopt such a questionable rendering of the clause as 'I shall advise regarding thee (with) mine eye'; but substitution of the resemblant form אַצִּיגָה is justified by the resultant meaning at once presented, 'I shall set mine eye upon thee'. In Ps. 35/11, the context demands change of לֹא יָדַעְתִּי into the resemblant לֹא גָזַלְתִּי, in order that the protestation of the Psalmist may become 'that which I took not away they demand from me'; and in verse 16 of the same Psalm, where the first three forms, viz. בְּחַנְפֵי לַעֲגֵי מָעוֹג are confessedly unworkable, substitution of the resemblants מְחֻלְפֵי לָעֲגוּ לָעֹג makes good sense ('those who scoffed at me go on mocking').

A remarkable case occurs in the middle of Num. 25/6, telling of a prominent Israelite who before the eyes of Moses and all the congregation, led a Midianitish woman to his tent for illicit intercourse. The Massoretes have unfortunately fixed for us an incorrect text, according to which the offender brought 'to his brethern the Midianitish woman[1]', for the received Hebrew is אֶל אֶחָיו אֶת הַמִּדְיָנִית; the correct reading of the clause is obviously אֶל אָהֳלוֹ אִשָּׁה מִדְיָנִית, which presents to us the appropriate statement that the sinner brought 'to his tent a Midianitish woman'[2].

Another passage which baffled the Massoretes and has been a standing source of trouble to exegetes occurs in

---

[1] It is to be observed that there is no mention, in the preceding context, of a woman to whom reference would be made by means of fhe defining article.

[2] The corresponding passage in the Septuagint (τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ πρὸς την Μαδιανίτιν) presents us with another erronous view,—that the Israelite brought his brother to the Midianitish woman.

Ps. 27, at the close of verse 12 and the beginning of verse 13; at the latter point the Hebrew editors have indicated their helplessness by marking the confessedly inappropriate form לוּלֵא ('unless') with several points. Perhaps Grätz has been the first and only critic to perceive that this must be viewed as an erroneous compound of two separate forms, viz. לִי לֹא, of which the former has unfortunately been torn from the end of the preceding verse, to which, accordingly, it must be restored. Here, however, the clause וְיֹפֵחַ חָמָס ('and one who breathes out cruelly') contains the construct form of an objective which occurs nowhere else, and which, as suggested by Grätz, might rather be the plural verb-form וְיָפִיחוּ ('and they breathe out') to accord with the preceding plural; a more fitting conclusion of verse 12, however, would be the circumstantial clause וּפַח חָפְשׂוּ לִי ('while a snare has been contrived for me'). Verse 13, now provided with the simple negative at the beginning, forms a natural continuation of what precedes 'I did not believe ('hope', or 'expect') to see the goodness of God in the land of the living'. Isa. 6/13 end a specially difficult passage, demanding drastic changes, see its result elsewhere.

In Ps. 31/21, for מֵרֶכְסֵי אִישׁ read מִנִּכְלֵי אֹיֵב ('from the wiles of an enemy'); and in the same verse, at the end, for מֵרִיב לְשֹׁנוֹת ('from the strife of tongues')—an expression far too weak to suit the context—read מֵאֹרֵב בַּחֲשֵׁכוֹת ('from an ambusher (lying) in deep darkness'). In Ps. 41/10, exchange of the closing term עָקֵב in favour of the sonal resemblant כְּאֵב affords relief by making the last clause signify 'he hath aggravated pain on me'; and in verse 13, for תָּמַכְתָּ בִּי, where the second of these two forms seems superfluous, read סְמַכְתָּנִי ('thou hast upholden me'). Ps. 36/7, for כְּהַרְרֵי אֵל read כִּנְהַר יְאֹר 'like the river Nile' same verse, for תּוֹשִׁיעַ read תַּשְׂבִּיעַ ('thou satisfiest'). Isa. 8/14, instead of 'to both the houses of Israel' read 'to the

officials of the house of Israel' (לְשָׂרֵי בֵּית). Ps. 77/3 the impossible יָדִי should be רוּחִי ('my spirit').

In Isa. 2/6 (at end) for the questionable form יַשְׁפִּיקוּ read the resemblant יְכַשְּׁפוּ ('they practise enchantments') as required by the context; in verse 9 (end) where the preceding context (verses 6 ff) describes the turning away, on the part of the people to consult soothsayers,sorcerers and others, in order to worship the work of their own hands, instead of turning to God for light and guidance, the conclusion וְאַל־תִּשָּׂא לָהֶם ('therefore, do not forgive them') seems too abrupt, and should rather be וְאַתָּה תִּשָּׂאֵל לָהֶם ('and thou art not at all enquired at by them'); in verse 16 (end), the expression 'ships of Tarshish' shows that the parallel noun שְׂכִיּוֹת in the next clause should be סְפִינוֹת ('pleasure vessels'). Ps. 42/5 for בַּסָּךְ אֶדַּדֵּם read בְּסֹד אַדִּירִים ('in the rear of Grandees').

In Prov. 17/1, the expression זִבְחֵי רִיב (lit. 'sacrifice of contention') can hardly be accepted as correct, and should rather give place to the resemblant טֶבַח וָרִיב ('a feast and contention').

In Ps. 52/11, the verb-form עָשִׂיתָ alone is obviously insufficient to form a complete statement, but we may assume that there has been i n a d v e r t e n t o m i s s i o n, by a transcriber, before it of לִי חָסֶד the former, because of resemblance, in form, to כִּי, and the latter, because of resemblance, in sound, to the verb—a wholly appropriate statement in the next verse, ('I trust in the kindness of God'). Moreover immediately after, for the verb-form וַאֲקַוֶּה, which gives a most unsuitable meaning ('and I shall expect'),substitute the resemblant וַאֲחַוֶּה which, with the succeeding noun, gives an entirely suitable meaning ('and I shall make known thy name'). Isa. 5/14, for וּשְׁאוֹנָהּ וְעָלֵז read וּגְאוֹנָם יַעֲלֹם ('and their haughtiness shall be hidden'). Isa. 10/4 for אַפִּיר put עֹשֵׁר and הָרוּגִים should be חֲנוּכִים.

In II. Chron. 14/14, the combination אָהֳלֵי מִקְנֶה cannot be regarded as correct; tents were not used for sheltering cattle, nor, surely, would the victors be so unwise as to 'smite' the animals and thus lessen the amount of spoil which they took away; but by amending the forms so as to become אֹהֶל וּמַחֲנֶה, there is secured the more fitting statement that Israel smote both 'tents and camps'; i. e. both persons of higher station who lived in tents and those of lower rank who had no such shelter, whether by day or by night.

It has generally been acknowledged that, at the opening of Isa. 9/2, הַגּוֹי לֹא should rather be the noun-form הַגִּילָה, which fitly accords with הַשִּׂמְחָה in the next clause; but it does not yet seem to have been perceived that the initial verb-form הִרְבֵּיתָ is unsuitable,—for one can hardly conceive of exultation being 'multiplied'. There seems good ground, accordingly, for holding that the opening term is a transcriptional error for the resemblant הֲרִימוֹתָ, which, combined with the corrected noun-form given above, is in complete harmony with the subsequent clause, and gives an appropriate parallel, 'thou hast heightened the exultation'.

In Isa. 9/13, it seems premature to state that the Lord hath 'cut off' the higher and the lower classes, seeing that mention is made of them afterwards as still existing; it may be preferable to change וַיַּכְרֵת into the sonal resemblant וַיַּחֲרֵד ('and he hath caused them to fear'); this will harmonise with another emendation further on,—the troublesome combination כִּפָּה וְאַגְמוֹן, for which there has been conjectured a questionable rendering ('palm-branch and reed') but which would more reasonably be substituted בְּפַחַד יֶאֱגְמוּ בְּיוֹם ('in fear (of an unknown cause) shall they be in dread in one day'). Isa. 10/14 for וַתִּמְצָא כַקֵּן read וַתֶּאֱבֹק כַּנֵּץ ('and my hand hath swiftly and strongly come upon. . . .')

In Isa. 9/17, the third last form has been misread

by the Massoretes and for generations presented as a difficulty to lexicographers and expositors.

As an Hithpael verb-form וַיִּתְאַבְּכוּ, this has necessarily required us to think of אָבַךְ as the root, but this is a mere conjecture. Satisfactory results, however, are obtained on turning to a noun-form of similar sound, and otherwise amending the Massoretic reading so that the last three words in the verse become וְיֶתֶר אָבָק וְגֵאוּת עָשָׁן (forming a circumstantial clause); considering now the natural outcome of a forest-fire, these four Hebrew words, may be rendered, 'While the residue (is) fine dust[1] and a proudly ascending colum of smoke' (lit. 'and pride of smoke').

In Ps. 90/10, the troublesome form וְרָהְבָּם may fitly give place to the resemblant יִרְהָבֻנוּ, which, with the combined nominatives following, give the appropriate expression 'toil and trouble beset us'.

In Isa. 40/4, the form הָרְכָסִים has proved an inexplicable problem for lexicographers and expositors, but the context, which shows that it should mean something opposed to the next noun בִּקְעָה ('wide and open valley'), is a corrupted amalgam, through aural error on the part of a transcriber of two nouns הַר עֲקָשִׁים (lit. 'a mountain of distortions (impediments)'—'a mount of obstacles'.

In Ps. 62/4, the impossible ἅπαες λεγ תְּהוֹתְתוּ may reasonably be resolved as an amalgam of תַּהּ תָּאֲוּוּ, so that the meaning may become '(how long) will ye earnestly desire a nonentity (impossibility)'. In Isa. 40/10 (latter part) וּזְרֹעוֹ מֹשְׁלָה לוֹ הִנֵּה שְׂכָרוֹ אִתּוֹ וּפְעֻלָּתוֹ לְפָנָיו, substitute the following; וְעֻזּוֹ נִשְׁלַח לוֹ הִנֵּה שַׁחַר אָתָה (or יֵאֵתֶה) וַאֲפֵלוֹת לְפָנִים;—

---

[1] On the precise meaning of אָבָק, see the Author's 'Studies in the Hebrew Synonyms'.

('and his help hath been sent by him hither, dawn is coming, though deep darkness (hath been) p r e v i o u s l y'), (cf. Ps. 20/3).

16. SUBSTITUTION OF SYNONYMOUS TERMS.

An interesting and important subject for investigation is the number of variations, by transcribers, in the employment of synonymous terms,—words different in form and origin, and fundamentally bearing distinctive meanings, but showing general agreement in being applied to the same c l a s s of objects. This general meaning, common to these different terms, has sometimes been misused by inexact copyists, who have substituted, for the proper and precise term which should have been retained, a different and less appropriate word, which nevertheless still indicates the object intended, though with less accuracy. Some illustratives instances of this interchange will clearly show the liberty taken by transcribers.

In Ps. 18/1, forming the superscription prefixed to the grand song of praise said to have been written by David after he had been delivered 'out of the house of all his enemies, and out of the hand of Saul', it is to be observed that the Hebrew term indicating 'hand' in the second last clause is כַּף, but יַד in the last clause; on the other hand, the parallel in II. Sam. 22/1 shows כַּף in b o t h clauses.

Of the Hebrew words indicating 'people' or 'nation', עַם, generally speaking, is the most honouring designation, and accordingly is often applied to God's chosen people (see עַם יְהוָה , Num. 11/29 etc.; עַמִּי, Exod. 3/7; 5/1 etc. עַם קָדוֹשׁ and סְגֻלָּה, Deut. 7/6), though sometimes to non-Israelites עַם נָכְרִי 'a foreign people', Exod. 21/8; עַם אַחֵר 'another people', Deut. 28/32. A second term, generally

found in poetry and prophetic writings, and there normally denoting rough and uncultured peoples, is לְאֹם (Gen. 25/23); the plural לְאֻמִּים mostly occurs (Gen. 27/29 ; Ps. 2/1 ; 149/7; Isa. 17/12, 13 ; 49/1 etc). A rare term is אֻמָּה (plur. אֻמּוֹת Num. 25/15, and אֻמִּים Ps. 117/1). Still another term, in frequent use, is גּוֹי (pl. גּוֹיִם) usually applied to non-Israelite or Gentile nations, civilized or uncivilized, not worshipping the true God (and hence sometimes rendered 'heathen'), Lev. 25/22; 26/33,38,45, Gen. 15/14; 18/18; 22/18; 26/4; 32/10; Josh. 3/17 ; 4/1 ; 5/8 etc. When comparison is made of the two forms of the Messianic prophecy in Isa. 2/2, 4 and Mic. 4/1, 3, while the language generally is the same in both passages, remarkable liberty is displayed by the transcribers in varying the terms signifying 'people' or 'nation'. At the end of Isa. 2/2, the closing expression is כָּל הַגּוֹיִם, but עַמִּים (אֻמִּים ?) in Mic. 4/1 ; near the beginning of Isa. 2/3, we find עַמִּים רַבִּים, but גּוֹיִם רַבִּים in Mic. 4/2 ; after the beginning of Isa. 2/4, there first appears הַגּוֹיִם and then לְעַמִּים רַבִּים (לְאֻמִּים), but עַמִּים רַבִּים and גּוֹיִם עֲצֻמִּים in Mic. 4/3.

Still more striking is the liberty taken by transcribers in their use of the Divine names. Though it is quite true that in some passages as entire books of the ordinary printed Hebrew Bible as we have received it from the Massoretes יְהוָה wholly or predominantly appears, אֱלֹהִים in others, and יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים in others, it does not follow that a 'Jehovist' was the author of the first class of books or passages, an 'Elohist' the author of the second, and the 'Deuteronomist' of the third ; examination of important Hebrew MSS. makes it clear that אֱלֹהִים was often used instead of יְהוָה, and conversely; choice of the noun was in great measure determined by the taste or judgment of the transcriber. Thus, Psalms 14 and 53 obviously had the same origin ; and it cannot be said hat the former had an Elohist as its author because 'God' appears predominantly in this and other poems in the first

division of the Psalter; and that a Jehovist, on the other hand, composed Psalm 53; the difference, so far as regards the use of the divine names, was one of choice in the transcription. Even in the case of a book acknowledged to be the genuine production of one and the same writer, he must surely be allowed full liberty in such a matter as this[1]. It is also to be noted that the Septuagint, in rendering the Divine names from the Hebrew, is far from uniform. Generally speaking, אֱלֹהִים is rendered by ὁ Θεός (Gen. 1/1, 2, 3, 4, 5 etc.) but sometimes by Κύριος (I. Sam. 23/16; II. Chr. 13/12); and יְהוָה by Κύριος or ὁ Κύριος (II. Kings 2/2. Cod. A. and Lucian), but also by ὁ Θεός (Cod. B.); indeed, so great has been the laxity, both in the primary Greek rendering and in subsequent transcription, that no safe inference can be drawn from the form of the divine names in the Septuagint.

In Zach. 14/20, where a description is given of exceptional circumstances under which a special Feast of Tabernacles will be held, the inexplicable and unsuitable collection of forms עַל מְצִלּוֹת הַסּוּס should give place to the fitting resemblant expression כָּל מַקְלוֹת הַסּוֹךְ ('all the rough-rods of the booth'). Ps. 65/6, latter half, for קְצִינֵי עָרִיץ וְאֵימַת דְּחֻקִים קַצְוֵי אֶרֶץ וְיָם רְחֹקִים read 'sub-judges of a brutal man, and a terror to oppressors'.

In Ps. 17/3, the dominant idea is that the Lord searches the heart of man; but the second clause פָּקַדְתָּ לַיְלָה (marked by the Note-line) 'thou hast visited (me) in the night', in the Massoretic text introduces a discordant note, which disappears when substitution is made of the resemblant

---

1) In Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, the change of names in Chapter I is remarkable: 'Jesus Christ' (verse 1) 'Christ Jesus' and 'our Lord Jesus Christ' (verse 2), 'the Lord Jesus Christ' (verse 3), 'Christ' (verse 6), 'Jesus Christ our Lord' (verse 9).

expression בִּקַּרְתָּ כָלָה ('thou hast examined thoroughly').

In Num. 11/30, the correctness of the opening form וַיֵּאָסֵף may be questioned, inasmuch as the fundamental idea of the root is the gathering together of a large company, whereas Moses and the elders formed a small company compared with the rest of the people; a more probable reading, accordingly, is the sonal resemblant וַיָּשָׁב ('and he returned').

In Ps. 67/5, where the Note-line has been inserted, more than one form requires attention. First, מִישׁר might preferably be read as בִּישֶׁר; next, the successive form וּלְאֻמִּים may safely be omitted as a superfluous repetition from the first clause; thirdly בָּאָרֶץ to which the Note-line is prefixed, ought rather to be the resemblant בְּאַרַח.

In Ps. 68/7, one and the same inappropriate form, בַּכּוֹשָׁרוֹת, at three different points exhibits mistaken substitution of letters—two in their shape, viz. ב instead of מ, and one in sound viz. ש instead of ס—but when rectification is made in these respects, so that the unworkable Massoretic reading becomes מַמּוֹסָרוֹת, the clause runs smoothly and gives an appropriate meaning,—'bringing prisoners out of (their) bonds'.

As no r a i n fell during the march of the Israelites through the wilderness, though they were abundantly supplied with manna for bread, in Ps. 68/10 גֶּשֶׁם must be regarded as a mistranscription of לֶחֶם ('bread').

Two letters require correction in Ps. 104/11; for יִשְׁבְּרוּ ('break') read יִשְׁבְּעוּ, so that the clause may give the meaning also indicated in the parallel clause, preceding, 'wild asses satisfy their thirst' יַשְׁבִּיעוּ.

In Psalm 68/35, e n d בַּשְּׁחָקִים וְעֻזּוֹ גַּאֲוָתוֹ should rather be אַהֲבָתוֹ וְעֻזְּרוֹ לְחֹשְׁקִים ('his love and his help (are) for those who l o v e intensely (or those who a r e dearly beloved)') (לַחֲשָׁקִים).

On the latter part of Ps. 69/5 the Massoretic text presents an incredible statement ('that which I did not plunder, then I will restore'); by changing אָז to אִי the sentence reads 'How can I return that which I did not plunder?'.

In Ps. 69/14, Wellhausen appropriately corrects the unworkable עֵת רָצוֹן into אַתָּה רְצֵנִי ('do thou take pleasure in me').

The opening form הִנֵּה ('behold') in Isa. 5/18 is more reasonably to be read as the resemblant חִנָּם ('in vain'), inasmuch as the context shows the prophet's acknowledgment of f a i l u r e to influence the erring people.

The expression כְּאַיִן שֻׁפְכוּ in Ps. 73/2 is more appropriately to be read as כְּיָוֵן שָׁקְעוּ ('as if (in) mud my steps sank down').

The latter portion of Ps. 73/19, in the Massoretic form, gives no suitable continuation of the opening; instead of the last three forms in the Received Text, read כָּעוֹב שְׁלוֹמָם תִּמְחֶה ('like a cloud, thou shalt wipe out their prosperity') the Septuagint simply confirms the Massoretic readings.

The first two forms in Ps. 76/4, שָׁמָּה שָׁבַר are unworkable; Duhm fitly substitutes שָׁם הִשְׁבִּית ('There he put an end to') this change further leads to another, at the end, where סֶלָה should be כְּלָה, this brings our parallelism ('sword and war he hath stopped').

Hos. 11/4, for עֹל עַל לְחֵיהֶם ('a yoke upon their jaw') does not suit the context, which indicates the k i n d n e s s a n d g e n t l e n e s s of the Lord, rather than the imposition of hardship; hence, read עוֹל עַל חֵיקָם, which, with the preceding participle, will give the appropriate expression 'like those who raise a suckling to their bosom'.

Isa. 33/15 presents us with a highly exceptional expression מִשְׁמַע דָּמִים ('from hearing bloodshed'), in which the second word must surely be דִּבּוֹת; when this is substituted, there is obtained an appropriate meaning ('from listening to slanders').

In the middle of Ps. 17/14, where mention is made of the Lord's filling the b e l l i e s of the wicked with His rich stores, one is hardly prepared for the Massoretic reading, immediately succeeding that the gourmands sated themselves with 'children'' it thus seems probable that, of the two words forming the expression יִשְׂבְּעוּ בָנִים, the second shall rather be the resemblant בָּרִים, so as to obtain the preferable resultant 'they sate themselves with fat lambs'.

In Ps. 17, to evolve good sense, emendation must be made at several points from the end of verse 13 onwards into the first part of verse 14. First, instead of מֵרָשָׁע, read מֵרֶשֶׁת, and thus, in connection with the two preceding words, secure a fitting close to the verse, ' deliver my soul from the net'. Secondly, transfer the unworkable form חַרְבְּךָ ('thy sword') from the end of verse 13 to the beginning of verse 14, but transformed into the resemblant מִ הָרֵךְ, of which the מ is to be prefixed to the form mistakenly vocalised as מִמְּתִים, and the whole vocalised anew as מִמְּחִימִים (Hiphil participle of מוּח, with prefixed מִן); in conjunction with the next two Massoretic forms, there is then obtained the appropriate resultant, 'slacken from man-slayers thy hand, O Lord'. Thirdly, the second of the two forms ממתים may probably be most appropriately re-written as the Hiphil participle מַמְתִּיקִים, which, with the next three words in the Received Text, מֵחֶלֶד, however, being changed to מֵחֵלֶב, may reasonably be rendered 'drawing sweetness from the best (lit. fat) of their lot in life'.

In Ps. 68/14, read the last two Massoretic forms as בְּרַק רְקוּ כְּחָרוּץ, and translate the last t h r e e words, thus, as a circumstantial clause, 'while her pinions rapidly flash as lightning like gold'.

In Ps. 68/18, for רֶכֶב read רִכְשׁ, and for אַלְפֵי שִׁנְאָן put אֱלֹף יַשְׁגִּיא, and under the wholesome: ('The properties (or e s t a t e s) of God (are) 20,000, (as) sovereign Lord,

among them (בָּם) puts highest Sinai as a holy place כְּקָדֶשׁ').

The last two forms in Ps. 76/5 (מֵהֲרֵי טָרֶף) should indicate comparison, and thus be changed to ('than those who frighten (a lion) tearing prey').

At the beginning of Ps. 78/21, where the Note-line has rightly been inserted at the side of שָׁמַע, this verb-form, which gives too mild a meaning ('heard') to suit the contexf, must be regarded as an error for the resemblant זָעַם ('was wroth'); the same change is required in verse 59.

In Num. 11/31, נָסַע (fitly marked by the Note-line) an inappropriate verb-form, should be סָעַר, which gives a suitable meaning ('wind blew strongly'); a similar change of יִסַּע to סָעַר must be made in the parallel passage, Ps. 78/26 ('an east wind blew strongly').

The concluding form in Ps. 78/26, תֵּימָן ('the South') does not suit the context; but when regarded as a debased amalgam of דֵּי מָן, we are able to render the latter half of the verse thus; the east wind 'drove before it, in its strength a sufficiency of manna'.

An unexpected and unsuitable statement in Ps. 78/63 is 'fire devoured (אָכְלָה אֵשׁ) his young men', but a more appropriate reading is אָבְלָה הָאֵם, which gives, as a resultant, 'His young men the mother bewailed'.

The whole verse, in Ps. 78/65 presents an unworthy view of God; instead of וַיִּיקַץ כְּיָשֵׁן ('and he awoke, like one sleeping') read וַיָּקָם בְּיֹשֶׁר (or לְיַשֵּׁר) ('and he arose in equity (or to rectify)'). Further, the pair of forms closing the verse, מִתְרוֹנֵן מִיָּיִן ('shouting because of wine') is similarly objectionable, probably should rather be מִתְרוֹמֵם מְיָוֵן ('raising himself out of miry clay').

Parallelism requires that in Ps. 80/7 the form מָדוֹן should rather be an absolute resemblant מָרוֹן, or simply רוֹן, so that the resultant meaning may become 'thou dost make us an object of derisive shouting'. For the same

reason, the concluding form לָמוֹ ('to themselves') must be regarded as a mistranscription of the resemblant לָנוּ ('us') which must be restored to produce the harmony required with the previous half of the verse ; this correction is confirmed by the corresponding form ἡμὰς in the Septuagint.

Several emendations are necessary in Ps. 81/15, for making it harmonise with the context. Instead of the Massoretic Text, read the following ; — מְשׂוֹנְאֵי יְהוָה יְכַחֲשׁוּ וְיִהְי עִתָּם לְעוֹלָם 'From those who hate the Lord they would be preserved by him, and he would be with them for one who (hears and) answers them'.

PART II.

EXTERNAL AIDS AVAILABLE FOR CORRECTION OF THE MASSORETIC TEXT.

In the preceding portion of this treatise, attention has mainly been directed to different classes of phenomena within the Received Hebrew Text itself indicating various lines in which divergence from the original has taken place; consideration of these different modes of deviation will give considerable help in detecting similar instances, and should give confidence in proposing emendations. Caution, however, must be observed in working towards conclusions; s u b j e c t i v e i n f l u e n c e, ever present, is likewise always subtle, and may sometimes mislead rather than lead in safe lines; a wise textual critic must thus always be ready to admit that many of his suggestions are to be regarded as merely tentative or provisional.

In this Second Part, attention is called to other aids which may be viewed as on the whole o b j e c t i v e, inasmuch as they are more or less external to the separate words or expressions in the current Massoretic Text which call for emendation because of the difficulties they present.

1. MASSORETIC NOTES.

Among the different external means which may be utilised for correcting the traditional Hebrew Text, the first place perhaps should be assigned to the Notes supplied by the Massoretes themselves, who indicated in the margin that instead of what they actually found w r i t t e n (כְּתִיב) in the Manuscripts from which they formed the text presented to us, there should be substituted another form to be r e a d (קְרִי)[1] as more correct. These marginal notes vary much in number; in most of the Books of Scripture, very few substitutions have been recommended, and even these are comparatively unimportant; keen examination of the text, however, would have led to the discovery of many more; a large number of corrections have been required in the prophecies of Jeremiah, which have fared rather badly at the hands of transcribers, and in Lamentations. Only a few specimens, taken from the Book of Joshua, may be cited: in 3/16, it is noted that בְּאָדָם should be מֵאָדָם; in 4 18, בַּעֲלוֹת should rather be כַּעֲלוֹת; in 5 1 עָבְרֵנוּ should properly be עָבְרָם; in 6 9 תָּקְעוּ is noted as תִּקְעֵי mistranscribed. After all, however, these Massoretic substitutions do not carry us far in the correction of the text, which must be scrutinized much more carefully than the Mediaeval editors have done, ere substantial improvements can be secured.

2. SEBIRIN.

Another class of marginal notes for the correction of the Received Hebrew Text is formed by the Sebîrîn (סְבִירִין,

---

[1] Some scholars, changing the vowels attached to this word, make it an i m p e r a t i v e viz. קְרִי ('Read').

i. e. 'supposed' (more correct readings)). These are very few, however, and, like the קְרִיוֹת, afford little help in making a satisfactory basis in the Scriptures. The Sebîrîn may be regarded as grammatical or syntactical corrections of the text, s u p p l e m e n t i n g the קְרִיוֹת and derived from Eastern and Babylonian editors[1]. Examples appear in Gen. 19/33, where הוּא is marked as defectively written instead of הַהוּא ; in Gen. 19/25, where הָאֵל should rather be הָאֵלֶּה; see also Gen. 18/25 ; יַעֲשֶׂה should be תַּעֲשֶׂה.

3. THE NOTE-LINE.

Far more important, practically, for the correction of the Hebrew Text than either of the two classes of Marginal Notes just mentioned is the Note-line, which was inserted at points demanding special attention as presenting peculiar readings[2]. The inserting scribe never ventured on suggesting a reading different from that found in the text from which he copied; he simply transmitted what was before him, with this sign superodded, however; but its appearance is always significant ; and in many cases, by asserting the attention of a patient student, may lead to the recovery of the original reading.

Instances have already been cited, incidently, in which this sign calls attention to an irregularity in the Massoretic Text[3]

---

1) See C. D. Ginsburg's learned Introduction to the Massoretics critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, pages 187 ff.

2) For a full discussion of this sign, see the Author's treatise on 'The Note-line in the Hebrew Scriptures, commonly called Páseq or Pesûq'.

3) See pages 5, 6, 45, 47, 48, 53, 57, etc. etc.

of the many classes formed by these abnormalities, a few may be indicated here. Superfluous words appear in Zaph. 2/2 ('not'), Zech. 1/17 ('again' repeated too often); Ex. 8/11 and Eccl. 8/14 (the relative sign a redundancy); Gen. 42/22 and II. Sam. 2/1 ('saying'); Isa. 10/20, 27 ('and it shall come to pass') etc. On the other hand omissions are noted in Ps. 45/13 ('shall come'); Lev. 10/17 ('the Lord'); Jer. 7/14 ('this'); Exek. 3/13 ('I heard'), etc. Further, attention is called to startling statements in Jud. 1/7 ('seventy Kings', where 'seven' must be the correct number); I. Chr. 29/23 ('the throne of the Lord'); I. Sam. 18/10 ('an evil spirit of God'), etc.

In seeking a solution of the textual difficulties marked by the Note-line, it becomes necessary to consider carefully, in the light of the many possible alterations already indicated in Part I, what was most probably the original from which the now received reading has been deflected. The queried form וְגִבַּרְתִּי at the beginning of Zach. 10/6, where the whole clause means 'And I will strengthen the house of Judah', was doubtless וְגָדַרְתִּי, which gives the appropriate sense, 'And I will fence round the house of Judah'. The form הֲלֹא in Ezek. 26/15, instead of an interrogative, should be the resemblant הָלְאָה ('far off'). The expression וְעַד אָבֵל הַגְּדוֹלָה ('even to the great meadow') in I. Sam. 6/18, rightly marked with the Note-line, certainly gives no sense,—not to speak of the obvious irregularity in grammatical construction; but after considering the mention previously made, in verse 14, of a 'large stone', the most natural solution of the difficulty is to substitute the words וְעֵד הָאֶבֶן הַגְּדוֹלָה ('and the large stone (is) witness'; cf. Gen. 31/44, 48, 52)[1]. The description in Ps. 15/3 of the upright man is hardly intelligible or translateable in the Massoretic form לֹא רָגַל עַל לְשֹׁנוֹ; but

---

[1] See Wellhausen's and Driver's remarks on the passage, also those of H. P. Smith (Int. Crit. Com.).

if this queried expression be viewed as a mistranscription of the resemblant expression לֹא רָכַל עַל שִׁכְנוֹ ('he who doth not slander his near neighbour'), one has the feeling that the genuine reading has been recovered[1].

More appropriate to the context than וְיָדְעוּ ('and they shall know') in Num. 14/31 is the resemblant וְיָרְשׁוּ ('and they shall inherit') which, indeed, is supported by the corresponding κληρονοκήσουσιν of the Septuagint.

Mountains, even when covered with trees, cannot readily be set ablaze; hence, in Ps. 83/15 (end) instead of הָרִים, a more appropriate term is the resemblant חוֹחִים ('thorns').

Mention, in I. Chr. 4/40, of 'Ham' as the ancestor of those who had long dwelt too comfortably in the region coveted by needy migrants, is hardly suited for the context; hence, instead of מִן־חָם, though this reading is supported by the Septuagint ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν χάμ, a preferable expression would be the resemblant form מוּנָחִים (Hoph. participle of נוּחַ 'left to rest quietly'). Further, in the middle of the next verse, where the received reading gives us to understand that the hard-pressed explorers smote the 'tents' of easy going inhabitants, it seems better to regard אָהֳלֵיהֶם as a mistranscribed אַחֲרִיתָם ('their posterity', or 'the remainder of them'); and the next accusative form הַמְּעוּנִים, may also be fitly taken as a scribal error for the resemblant הַמּוּעָלִים (Hoph. participle of עוּל), to obtain the appropriate idea of 'the suckled male children'.

4. THE CONTEXT AS A GUIDE IN CORRECTING THE TEXT

Many are the instances in which, for corection of the Received Hebrew Text, no distinctively external help is

---

1) For further illustrations, see the treatise on the Note-line, pages 78 ff.

given by the Massoretic Notes, or by the Sebîrîn, or by a Note-line, in definitely locating the precise point where difficulty lies; nevertheless after careful consideration of the whole passage, it becomes possible, both to perceive what is the disturbing factor, and further, f r o m t h e c o n t e x t, to infer what is the correct reading. When the dominating line of thought is discovered, the point of interruption and the offending factor are somewhat easily determined and solution of the difficulty is simplified. Only a few illustrations need be given.

The Massoretic Text of Gen. 2/2, simply translated, runs thus: 'And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made'; but as the preceding account of the Creation states that this was accomplished in s i x days (1/31), 'the seventh' (הַשְּׁבִיעִי) in the first part of this verse is a later transcriptional error for 'the sixth' (הַשִּׁשִּׁי); this correction is fitly confirmed by the witness of the Septuagint, the Peshito, and the Samaritan. In Gen. 5/3. where it is stated regarding Adam that 'he begat in his likeness', there has obviously been omission from the Massoretic Text of בֵּן ('a son') after the verb.

In Jacob's statement to Laban regarding the prosperity which had attended his sojourn with his uncle and father-in-law (Gen. 30/30), there occurs the expression, 'the Lord hath blessed thee, at my foot'; the closing term in the Massoretic Text, לְרַגְלִי, has been variously explained to mean 'after me', or 'since my coming', or 'at every step of mine'; but examination of a similar expression previously used by Laban (end of verse 27) shows that the correct reading is בִּגְלָלִי ('for my sake'). Further on, in the same verse (Gen. 30/30), Jacob asks, according to the Massoretic Text, 'When shall I do (something) for my own household?' The incompleteness of thought in the verb-form אֶעֱשֶׂה, how-

ever, as well as the context constrains to the conclusion that the original was אַעֲשִׂיר, so that the correct meaning is 'When shall I gain riches for my own household?' Later still, in the same passage (Gen. 30/32), after Jacob had specified what he claimed as his reward for continuing in Laban's service, there is added, in the Massoretic Text, the incomplete sentence וְהָיָה שְׂכָרִי ('and my reward shall be'); but there has obviously been an inadvertent omission of the resemblant זֶה; when this is restored, the clause assumes a satisfactory shape ('and this shall be my reward'). Describing these relative positions when Laban overtook Jacob in his flight from Padan-Aram, the Massoretic Text in Gen. 31/25 states that the latter had pitched 'his tent' (אֶת־אָהֳלוֹ) in one spot while the former had pitched 'with his brethern' (אֶת־אֶחָיו) in another; as the verb תָּקַע, occurring in both clauses, is the term normally employed in this connection, and as the succeeding expression in the second clause ('with his brethern') is only slightly different in form from the corresponding expression in the earlier, it is safe to infer that אֶת אָהֳלוֹ is the correct reading in the second clause. The Massoretic Text in Gen. 41/51 represents Joseph as stating the reason for naming his eldest son 'Manasseh' thus 'God hath made me forget all my toil (עֲמָלִי) and all the house of my father'; as he did not, however, in fact, forget his father's house, the closing words בֵּית אָבִי, must be a mistranscription of something similar in form, and at the same time allied in sense to the preceding form 'my toil': the form desired must surely be כְּאֵבִי ('my pain'). To show the eagerness with which Pharaoh would latterly be glad to rid himself of the Israelites, on whose account he and his people had suffered grievously, Ex. 11/1 states, 'he will send you from this when he sends completely'; the whole verse, however, is rather unworkable, but difficulty is removed when the expression כְּשַׁלְּחוֹ כֻּלָּה is changed to כְּשַׁלְּחוֹ

כֶּלֶב, which makes the clause mean 'he will send you from this as he sends away a dog'. The first part of Lev. 5/1, has become so seriously deformed in course of transcription as to have now become scarcely intelligible : 'And when a soul sinneth, and heareth the sound of an oath, he being a witness, either seeing or knowing ; if he doth not tell, then he shall bear his guilt' ; but by changing תֶּחֱטָא into its resemblant תֶּחְבָּא, and קוֹל אָלָה into קוֹל עָוְלָה, the whole becomes clear : 'And when anyone hideth himself, and heareth any kind of iniquity,—he being a witness, either seeing or knowing—if he doth not inform, then he shall bear his guilt'. The brief prohibition forming the first part of Lev. 19/26 is unintelligible in its received form, לֹא תֹאכְלוּ עַל הַדָּם ('Ye shall not eat upon the blood') ; but when the last two forms in the expression are changed into כָּל חֵרֶם, the whole becomes clear ('Ye shall not eat any devoted thing',—. . . . for this was sacred to the Lord). Difficulty presents itself at the close of Lev. 22/24, according to the received text : 'And anything bruised, or crushed, or torn, or cut, ye shall not offer to the Lord ; and in your land ye shall not act' ; if, however, in the last clause בְּאַרְצְכֶם be changed to its resemblant כִּרְצֹנְכֶם, a satisfactory meaning is secured ('according to your own pleasure ye shall not act') ; see Est. 1/8 ; Dan. 8/4, etc. The opening portion of Lev. 23/17, part of the directions regarding the Feast of Pentecost, likewise presents difficulty, as indicated by the Note-line : the expression מִמּוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם תָּבִיאוּ לֶחֶם ('out of your dwellings shall ye bring bread') may certainly be questioned, and, in the light of the context, should be replaced by בְּמִשְׁאֲרֹתֵיכֶם תֹּאפוּ לֶחֶם ('in your kneading-troughs shall ye bake bread'). In the answer of the Lord to Moses regarding the punishment of Miriam, Num. 12/14, more than one difficulty is presented by the Massoretic Text ; part of which, simply rendered, runs thus ; 'And her father actually spat in her

face,—would she not be disgraced for seven days?'. In view of the whole context, mention of her father seems specially irrelevant, and the opening clause וְאָבִיהָ יָרֹק יָרַק is to be regarded as a mistranscription of הֲיָרֹק יָרַק[1]; moreover, as required by the verb-form וַתִּסָּגֵר ('so she was shut up') at the beginning of the next verse, ought to be the resemblant תִּכָּלֵם; after these changes are effected, the passage runs smoothly ('If any one should spit (lit! If the spitter should spit') in her face, would she not be shut up for seven days?'). In the account of the proposal by the discontented Israelites in the wilderness to renounce the leadership of Moses and Aaron, and to return to Egypt, the Massoretic Text of Num. 14/4 represents them as saying, 'Let us give a leader, and let us return to Egypt'; the first verb, however, נִתְּנָה, must surely be a transcriptional error for the resemblant נְמַנֶּה ('Let us appoint') which the context would rather incline us to expect; see Dan. 1/11; I. Chr. 9/29. In verse 12 of the same chapter, after the proposal to smite the rebellious people with the pestilence, there follows the highly questionable verb-form אוֹרִישֶׁנּוּ, on which there has commonly been imposed the strained meaning, 'I will disinherit them'; most probably, however, as shown by the context, the true reading is the resemblant אֲשָׁרְשֵׁם ('I will root them out'). Further on, in verse 17, the Received Hebrew Text represents Moses as entreating the Lord to magnify His 'Power' towards the rebellious people; but as the great leader proceeds (verse 18) to urge that the Lord has previously declared His great mercy and long suffering, and readiness to forgive, the form כֹּחַ must surely be an error for חֵן ('grace', or 'favour'). Moreover, in verse 35, where the vague expression זֹאת אֲעֶשֶׂה

---

[1] See parallel instances of this construction in Num. 6/9; Deut. 22/8; Ezek. 33/4.

('this will I do') in the Massoretic Text is reasonably marked by the Note-line, the resemblant expression זָעַם אֶזְעֹם ('I am utterly indignant') more fitly indicates what the Lord might be expected to declare. At the opening of his reply to Korah and his company in their presumption, Moses is represented in the Massoretic Text of Num. 16/5 as using the awkward expression בֹּקֶר וְיֹדַע יְהוָה אֶת אֲשֶׁר לוֹ ('(In the) morning, the Lord will make known those who are His'); as He soon showed, however, on that very day who were His, the opening words are highly questionable, and we may readily accept as more appropriate the resemblant form בָּחַר וַיִּיעַד, which makes the whole clause mean, 'The Lord hath chosen and appointed those who are His'.

In Deut. 15/7, commanding regard for the poor and needy throughout the land, the expression בְּאַחַד שְׁעָרֶיךָ ('in any of thy gates') must be a mistranscription of בְּאַחַת עָרֶיךָ ('in any of thy cities'); the same correction must be made in 16/5 and 17/2. In Deut. 15/14, requiring liberal provision for a Hebrew servant who was set free at the end of seven years, the context shows that the troublesome expression הַעֲנֵק תַּעֲנִיק must have originally been the resemblant הַעֲרֵךְ תַּעֲרִיךְ; and in the middle of the verse, אֲשֶׁר should be כַּאֲשֶׁר; after these changes are made, the sense becomes the following, 'Thou shalt by al means tax thyself for him . . . . according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee'. The first part of Deut. 16/18 is not quite satisfactory in its received form, which, fairly interpreted, runs thus: 'Judges and officers shalt thou give to thyself in all thy gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, for thy tribes'; after careful consideration of the whole message, however, it will be found necessary to change תִּתֶּן into תָּמֵן, שְׁעָרֶיךָ into עָרֶיךָ, and לִשְׁבָטֶיךָ into לְשָׁפְטֶךָ; and when these corrections are made, fitting sense is evolved thus, 'Judges and officers shalt thou appoint for thyself in all thy cities which the Lord thy God giveth thee, to judge thee'.

According to the Massoretic Text of Jud. 9/6, the Shechemites made Abimelech King, 'near an oak set up' in Shechem; as the expression עִם אֵלוֹן מֻצָּב is impracticable, some critics have proposed to substitute עַל אֵלוֹן הַמַּצֵּבָה ('near the oak of (i. e. 'at') the old standing-stone'); it may be better, however, to read עַל־אֶבֶן נִצָּבָה ('near a standing-stone'). In the warning to Abimelech regarding the treachery of Gaal and his company, Zebul is represented in the Massoretic Text of Jud. 9/31 as saying הִנֵּם צָרִים אֶת הָעִיר עָלֶיךָ; as the first part of this expression, however, is unworkable, there need be little hesitation in substituting, at the beginning, הִנָּם מְעִירִים, so that suitable sense may be secured ('behold, they are inciting the city against thee').

The last clause in I. Sam. 2/24[1], containing words addressed by Eli, to his profligate sons regarding their conduct, shows light attachment to what precedes ('the rumour which I hear is not good, causing the people of the Lord to transgress'); but by changing the unworkable expression מַעֲבִירִים עַם יְהוָה into the resemblant בְּעָבְרִי בְעַם יְהוָה, there is secured an eminently suitable sentence ('not good is the report which I hear as I pass among the people of the

---

1) The Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel has unfortunately come down to us in an unsatisfactory condition, but the Ancient Greek Version frequently proves a reliable guide to better readings. The first serious attempt to correct the Massoretic Text was made—not always successfully—by O. Thenius (Die Bücher Samuelis, Leipzig, 1842 and 1864), then more acutely by Wellhausen (Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, Göttingen, 1871), and by Klostermann (in Strack and Zöckler's series of commentaries, Nördlingen, 1887), most fully by Driver (Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, Oxford, 1889, and 1913), and by H. P. Smith (in the International Critical series of Commentaries, Edinburgh, 1899). The passages treated here have not yet received sufficient attention.

Lord'). In Abigail's prudent advice to David, dissuading him from hasty retaliation towards Nabal for his insult, lest this might issue in bloodshed which would be regretted afterwards, there occurs a perplexing expression in the Massoretic Text of I. Sam. 25/31 (fitly marked with the Note-line) לְפוּקָה וּלְמִכְשׁוֹל לֵב (sometimes rendered 'for a staggering and stumbling of heart'); the first noun-form is unique, and highly questionable; but if substitution be made of the resemblant expression לְתוּגָה וּלְמַכְאֹב לֵב ('for grief and for pain of heart'), objection is removed. In the first verse of David's lament over the deaths of Saul and Jonathan, in II. Sam. 1/19, the forms צְבִי and חָלָל are unworkable; but if substitution be made of the resemblants הִנָּצֵב and חֵיל respectively, the whole runs smoothly ('Take thy stand, O Israel, upon thy heights. Wail! How have heroes fallen'). In II. Sam. 12/18, containing the deliberations of David's attendants in their hesitation to tell him that the child of his shame was dead, the grammatical construction of the Massoretic Text is decidedly awkward; but if וְאִיךְ be changed to וְאִם, and וְעָשָׂה into נַעֲשֶׂה, difficulty is removed, and the course of thought runs smoothly ('and if we say to him, The child is dead, we shall do evil'). The Barzillai's request to David that he should be permitted to return to his own house and die there, and be buried with his ancestors, the Massoretic Text of II. Sam. 19/38 exhibits lack of a verb in the expression עִם קֶבֶר אָבִי וְאִמִּי ('with the sepulchre of my father and my mother'); but if this reading be changed to וְאֶקָּבֵר עִם אָבִי וְאִמִּי ('and let me be buried with my father and my mother'), difficulty disappears.

Solomon's command to Benaiah, I. Kings 2/31, regarding Jacob, is somewhat strange in its Massoretic form פְּגַע בּוֹ וּקְבַרְתּוֹ ('fall upon him, and bury him'); as one would rather expect the second imperative to be a term signifying to 'slay', or 'put to death', this perhaps should be the

similarly sounded וְחַרַבְתּוֹ ('and put him to the sword'), (though there is no parallel instance of such a denominative verb-form חֶרֶב). In Solomon's beautiful dedication-prayer at the opening of the Temple, there are several unfortunate transcriptional errors in the Massoretic Text of I. Kings 8/—one of these is the substitution of תִּשְׁמַע ('thou wilt hear') for the resemblant תִּשְׁעֶה or תִּשַׁע ('thou wilt regard') in verses 30, 32, 34, 36, 39, 43; connected therewith is the inconsiderate substitution of הַשָּׁמַיִם ('the heavens') instead of הַשְּׁחִים ('the downcast') in the same verses. The Massoretic reading וַיִּכְרֶה לָהֶם כֵּרָה גְדוֹלָה, at the beginning of II. Kings 6/23, has been a puzzle to lexicographers, though the underlying sense—that the King of Israel provided abundant food for the Syrian invaders who had been miraculously cast into his hands—is patent from the context; difficulty, however, disappears when the text is amended thus, וַיַּכְרֵם לֶחֶם בִּרְיָה גְדֹלָה ('and he made them eat bread—a large meal'); see בְּרִיָה etc. in the Lexicons. The lepers who found that the Syrians who had been besieging Samaria were fled, leaving all their impedimenta in their camp, are reported in the Massoretic Text of II. Kings 7/9 as saying נָבֹאָה וְנַגִּידָה בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ ('let us go and tell the King's household'); but as the construction of the second verb with the accusative is unusual, and especially because the lepers formed this resolution during the night, it is more likely that this form should be the resemblant וְנָעִירָה ('and let us arouse'); similarly, in verse 11, וַיַּגִּידוּ should be וַיָּעִירוּ ('and they aroused').

In figurative language, Isa. 10/27 announces the deliverance of Israel from foreign oppression: 'his burden shall be removed from off thy back, and his yoke from off thy neck'; but one is not prepared for the Massoretic reading which forms the close, וְחָבַל עֹל מִפְּנֵי שָׁמֶן, which has been held to mean, 'and the yoke shall be broken because of fatness'; a fitting finish, however, in harmony with what

precedes, is obtained by substituting a slightly different reading, וְחֶבֶל עַל מִפָּנִים יִשָּׁמֵט ('while the rope of the yoke will fall down in front'). It is hardly possible to accept as correct the opening clause of the received Hebrew in Joel 2/9 which states regarding the locust-swarms that 'they run backwards and forward in the city' ; the peculiar motion of these devastators is rather ever o n w a r d, and on looking at the succeeding context, which tells of their running on the city wall[1] and entering houses through the windows, one is constrained to conclude that בָּעִיר יָשֹׂקוּ must be a mistranscription of the resemblant בַּקִּיר יִסְקוּ ('they go up the face of the wall'). Some one has pointed out, as remarkable, that in the Psalmist's contemplation (8/4) of the glory of the 'heavens', 'the moon, and the stars', according to the Massoretic Text, there is no mention made of the glorious s u n ; it is thus reasonably suggested that שֶׁמֶשׁ, not שָׁמַיִךְ, is the probable reading. The Psalmist, in 39/2, according to the Received Text, determined to be circumspect in his 'ways', that he might not sin with his 'tongue' ; most probably, however, instead of דְּרָכַי ('my ways'), we should read the resemblant דְּבָרַי ('my words').

5. DEUTEROGRAPHS AS AIDS IN DISCOVERING DEVIATIONS FROM THE ORIGINAL TEXT.

A highly important class of passages in the Old Testament is formed of Deuterographs—copies of what was primarily one and the same document, now appearing in different places. These frequently prove most helpful as guides in correction of the text, inasmuch as the variations

---

[1] See remarks on the meaning of terms signifying 'wall' in the Author's 'Studies in Hebrew Synonyms', page 8 ff.

which they exhibit show how divergences from the original have arisen. Comparison in detail of two such passages gives confidence in laying down general principles, which may be applied for solving difficulties in the numerous passages which have no twin document. A full list of these Deuterographs is given by R. B. Girdlestone in his convenient and useful manual[1], which presents the altered passages in parallel columns (in English with explanatory foot-notes); only a few need be indicated here.

The forms of the Decalogue in Ex. 20/1, 17 and in Deut. 5/6,21, show unimportant variations. The first word of the fourth commandment, as given in Exodus, is 'Remember', while the beginning, in Deuteronomy, is 'Keep'; and at the end, the Exodus-form refers to the six days of the Creation-Week followed by the seventh rest-day as the ground of the injunction, while the Deuteronomy-form closes with a reminder of the Egyptian bondage, that rest from labour should be enjoyed by servants as well as masters. Positive errors of transcription, however, do not appear in these two forms.

Some verses in the Book of Joshua (viz. 15/13, 19 and 63; also 17/11, 13; 16/10; 24/28, 31) have been utilised, with slight variations by the compiler of the Book of Judges (in 1/10, 15, 20, 21, 27, 29; also 2/6, 9); but the only noteworthy difference in transcription is that the burial-place of Joshua is given in the Book bearing his name, 24/30 (see also 19/50) as תִּמְנַת סֶרַח, whereas this is given as תִּמְנַת חֶרֶס in Jud. 2/9.

Considerable variation, however, in the spelling of

---

1) Deuterographs; duplicate passages in the Old Testament (Oxford, 1894); see also the Inaugural Dissertation of F. Vodel (Die Konsonantischen Verianten in den doppelt überlieferten poetischen Stüeken des massoretischen Textes, Leipzig, 1905).

proper names, becomes evident when the lists of the Levitical cities, as given in Josh. 21/15, 39 and in I. Chron. 6/39, 66, are compared. Thus, חלן in Josh. 21/15 appears as חילן in I. Chron. 6/43 ; עלמון in Josh. 21/18 is represented by עלמת in I. Chr. 6/45 ; etc. Even wider deviations present themselves in later verses.

An extensive field comes into view when the narratives in the Books of Samuel and the Books of Kings are compared with the corresponding accounts in the Books of Chronicles. The Massoretic Text in the Books of Samuel is frequently unsatisfactory, and must be corrected by the record in the Chronicles—even though this Book was written later—as well as by its old Version into Greek[1]. As this field has been very thoroughly explored by capable scholars, it may be most convenient simply to refer the reader to their works. Similarly, reference must be made to works on the Books of Kings[2].

Specially valuable and instructive, as affording many illustrations of variations, frequently synonymous, introduced by transcribers, is a comparison of II. Sam. 22/ with Psalm 18/. Grätz, Delitszch, Baethgen, Duhm, Briggs, Bennett (W. H.) in Hebraica, vol. IV pages 65 ff. and other writers have examined these two correlatives very carefully; for convenience' sake, a few specimens of the differences may be given here,—the former Deuterograph being indicated briefly as S. and the latter as P. At the end of S. 1, מִכַּף ('from the hand') is used, but מִיַּד in P. 1. ; in S. 2. אלהי corresponds to אֵלִי ('my God') in P. 2 ; אֶקְרָא ('I call') in S. 7 corresponds to אֲשַׁוֵּעַ in P. 7 ; at the beginning of S. 5 ('when') appears, but it is not found in P. 5 ; and further

---

1) See foot-note on page 215.

2) See especially Burney's Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings (Oxford, 1903).

on, חֶבְלֵי מָוֶת ('the pangs of death') sēems in P, but משִׁבְרֵי מָוֶת in S; near the end of S 7, תָּבוֹא ('entereth') does not appear, but it occurs in P 7; again, S 8 presents the improbable reading מוֹסְדוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם ('the foundations of the heavens'), while the more likely reading מוֹסְדֵי הָרִים ('the foundation of the mountains') occurs in P 8; the improbable form וַיֵּרָא ('and he was seen') occurs in S 11, but the more suitable resemblant וַיֵּדֵא ('and he flew') in P 11; the form סִתְרוֹ ('his secret place') is not found in S 12, but it appears in P 12; further, the unique expression חַשְׂרַת מַיִם (alleged to mean 'a gathering of waters') corresponds to חֶשְׁכַּת מַיִם ('darkness of waters'); next, the expression עָבְיו עָבְרוּ ('his clouds passed away') in P 13, is represented in S 13 by the single word בָּעֲרוּ ('consumed'). Other differences between the two Deuterographs may easily be detected on careful comparison. It is important also to note that the transcriber of the Psalm regularly inserted the vowel-letters whereas the copy in II. Samuel rarely has them; cf. וּמְצוּדָתִי in P 3, with וּמְצָדָתִי in S 3; אֶפָּפוּנִי and יְבַעֲתְנִי appears in P 5; but אֶפָּפְנִי and יְבַעֲתְנִי in S 5; etc.

As regards the Psalter, two classes of duplicates present themselves. First, within the Book itself, there are pairs of Psalms, or duplicates portions of Psalms derived from the same original, but now differing, more or less, from one another; such are Ps. 14 (Jehovistic) and Ps. 53 (Elohistic); Ps. 108 is partly (verses 2—6) made up of a portion (verses 8—12) of Ps. 57, and the latter portion (verses 7—14) of Ps. 60. Ps. 31/2, 3 and Ps. 71/1—2 are parallels presenting noteworthy and instructive variations. The latter part (verses 14—18) of Ps. 40 re-appears (with the lack of the opening imperative, and other omissions) as Ps. 70 (2—6). Part of Ps. 115 (verses 4—8) occurs again as part of Ps. 135 (verses 15—20), but with some omissions and variations. In all these cases, probably, neither of the two forms is to be regarded

as the original; both, rather, are to be viewed as derived from a common source.

As to the instructive variations in these duplicates, it may be enough here to compare Ps. 14 with 53. Besides noting that the former, as a 'Jehovistic' writing, has יְהוָה, in verses 2 and 4, while the latter, as 'Elohistic', has אֱלֹהִים in the corresponding verses, it is to be observed that עַוְלָה in 14/1 is represented by עָוֶל in 53/2; the beginning of 14/3 is הַכֹּל סָר, while כֻּלּוֹ סָג appears in 53/4; after the beginning of 53/5, there occurs the expression לֹא הָיָה פַּחַד, but this has no correlative in Ps. 14. After this point, on to the end, there is considerable divergence between the two texts, which rewards careful examination.

The second class of Duplicates is formed of those in which a whole Psalm, or part of a Psalm, appears also in another Book of Scripture. Attention has already been called[1] to the fact that Ps. 18 and II. Sam. 22 are extensive Deuterographs. But other instances are found in which part of a Psalm (one verse or more) appears also in another portion of Scripture; thus Ps. 28/5 is nearly identical with Isa. 5/12; Ps. 68/2 is practically the same as Num. 10/35; Ps. 72/8 is the same as Zech. 9/10; Ps. 98/3 and Isa. 52/10 are substantially the same; Ps. 79/6, 7, closely resembles Jer. 10/25, and Ps. 135/7 forms part of Jer. 10/13.

In II. Kings 18/13 to 20/19 and Isa. 37/1, 39, there are found noteworthy parallel accounts of an episode in the history of Jerusalem, when Sennacherib the King of Assyria came against the city, bringing distress on King Hezekiah and the inhabitants, though he failed to take the capital; mention is also made of Hezekiah's mistaken kindness towards ambassadors from the King of Babylon; these two parallels vary little from each other, but a third account of

---

1) See page 203—4.

the same period, considerably recast, appears in II. Chr. 32/1, 33. Instructive variations between the two most closely allied accounts are וּשְׁדֶמָה in II. Kings 19/26 as compared with וּשְׁדֵמָה in Isa. 37/27; סָחִישׁ in II. Kings 19/29, but שָׂחִיס in Isa. 37/30; וַיִּשְׁמַע in II. Kings 20/13, but וַיִּשְׂמַח in Isa. 39/2.

Notable duplicates appear in Isa. 2/2, 4 and Mic. 4/1, 3. If one of these two contemporary prophets borrowed from the other, it may be impossible to decide which is the original writer, but it is also possible that both borrowed this beautiful passage from an older prophet whose other writings have not been preserved. Of instructive variations, it is sufficient to note the occurrences of כָּל הַגּוֹיִם at the close of Isa. 2/2, while עַמִּים appears in Mic. 4/2; conversely עַמִּים appears at the beginning of Isa. 2/3, but גּוֹיִם in Mic. 4/2; lastly, whereas we read in Isa. 2/4 that the Divine Teacher is to 'judge between the nations, and correct many peoples', it is stated in Mic. 4/3 that he shall 'judge between many peoples, and correct strong nations afar off'.

The Book of Jeremiah is specially remarkable as regards duplicates, in several aspects. First, within the collection itself, repetitions present themselves ; thus, Jer. 10/12, 16 re-appears in 51/15, 19; Jer. 23/5, 8 recurs, with some variations, partly in 33/14, 16 and partly in 16/14, 15; Jer. 49/19, 21 is found again, with some changes, in 50/44, 46. Secondly the close resemblance, or even identity, subsisting between passages in Jeremiah and many in other passages of Scripture is more striking, and has naturalty raised discussion regarding the priority, or originality, of these related portions ; thus, compare Jeremiah 48/45, 46 with Num. 21/28, 29; Jer. 48/19, 33 and 36 with Isa. 16/6, 8 and 10, 11; Jer. 48/43, 44 with Isa. 24/17, 18; Jer. 50/39, 40 with Isa. 13/19, 21; compare also Jer. 10/13 with Ps. 135/7; Jer. 10/25 with Ps. 79/6, 7. Part of Obadiah's prophecy (verses 1—6, 8, 9 and 16) also occur, though differently arranged, in Jer. 49/7,

10 and 12, 16; but it is hardly possible to determine whether one of these two prophets is to be regarded as the original writer, or whether both borrowed from an earlier prophet. Many parts of Jeremiah display close resemblance, in language and spirit, to the contents of Deuteronomy.

Besides the instances, cited above, in which similar or identical passages, of greater or less extent, occur in different places, there are many single verses which also appear Ezek. 7/19, as Deuterographs, identical or resemblant, in different connections. Thus is identical with Zeph. 1/18; also Ezek. 18/2 with Jer. 31/29; moreover, Num. 10/35 with Ps. 68/1; Deut. 32/36 with Ps. 135/14. Variations, however, appear when comparison is made between Ps. 79/10 and Joel 2/17; between Deut. 32/7 with Ps. 77/5 etc. Study of these passages often throws much light on the origin of variations.

6. PARALLELISM AS A GUIDE TO EMENDATION.

That prominent feature in the poetic portions of the Hebrew Scriptures known as Parallelism frequently proves a safe guide in recovering the original text after this has been lost through mistranscription. A few explanatory remarks on the nature of Parallelism in Hebrew poetry are necessary before proceeding to show how it may be utilised for emendation.

Parallelism in the Hebrew Scriptures may be defined generally as such an arrangement of the successive clauses forming sentences, that each of these in lines of similar length is dominated by one common idea, though this is presented, at every turn, in varying aspects, and set forth in varied terms. The symmetry is eminently one of thought. Piarallelism abound in the poetical parts of Scripture—the

Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Lamentations—and occasionally occur in other Books, especially the prophetical writings. The certainty that such compositions come originally framed on these harmonious lines assures the critic that, whenever deviation form this rule appears, something must have gone wrong with the Text at this point ; and the problem presented to him for solution is how, with the minimum of change in the Massoretic Text, harmony in thought and expression may be satisfactorily restored[1].

The first serious endeavour in later times to investigate and set forth the principles regulating Parallelism in the Hebrew Scriptures was made by Bishop Lowth[2]. Some later writers, however, have gone further, and made needless refinements in classifying Parallelisms. Only the most obvious and most important classes can be noted here.

1. Simple or Synonymous Parallels are of frequent occurrence ; these present, in the second line, substantially the same thought as in the first, but in another aspect, and in different language. The following are a few specimens :

Ps. 34/4 Magnify the Lord with me ;
Let us exalt his name together.
Ps. 102/2 Lord, hear my prayer ;
And let my cry come unto thee.
Ps. 114/3 The sea saw and fled ;

---

1) It is of small moment, practically, to consider here whether those who composed the poetical parts of Scripture formed the separate lines, or strophes, or words exhibiting certain syllabic measures (trimeter, tetrameter, pentameter, hexameter). An excellent account of the various attempts to discover laws of construction is given in W. H. Cobb's Treatise on Systems of Hebrew Metre (Oxford, 1905).

2) See his Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, and the Preliminary Dissertation in his volumes on the Prophecies of Isaiah ; many editions of both works have appeared.

Jordan was driven back.

Job. 38/28 Hath the rain a father?
Or who hath begotten drops of dew?

A rarer modification of simple parallelism is formed by inserting in the second line, the order of the terms observed in the first:

Ps. 51/4 Wash me from mine iniquity
And from my sin purify me. } Amended—/a

2. Amplified Parallels show greater development of thought. Examples are.—

Ps. 127/1 If the Lord build not a house,
Its builders labour in vain;
If the Lord keep not a city,
A keeper watcheth in vain.

Prov. 3/19,20 The Lord in His wisdom founded the earth;
With understanding hath He established the heavens;
By His knowledge the depths gush forth,
And clouds drop down dew.

Ps. 24/3, 5 Who shall ascend into the Mount of the Lord,
Or who shall stand in His holy place?
The clean of hand and pure of heart,
Who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity,
And hath not sworn deceitfully.

3. Reasoned Parallels present, in one line, the result or consequence of what is stated in the other. Thus:—

Ps. 143/8. Satisfy me in the morning with thy kindness,
For in thee do I trust;
Cause me to know the way in which I should walk,
For unto thee do I lift up my soul.

Lam. 3/24 The Lord is my portion, saith my soul;
Therefore will I hope in Him.

Ps. 27/1 The Lord is my light and my salvation,—

Whom should I fear?
The Lord is the strength of my life,—
Whom should I dread?

4. Antithetic Parallels are those in which the thought contained in one is contrasted with that which is represented in the other. Examples are,—

Prov. 10/12 Hatred stirreth up contentions,
But love casteth a covering over all transgressions.

Prov. 10/27 The fear of the Lord addeth days,
But the years of a wicked man are shortened.

Prov. 15/8 The sacrifice of wicked men is an abomination to the Lord,
But the prayer of upright men is His delight.

5. Parallels presenting Comparison also occur. Such are,—

Ps. 42/2 As a hart (that) longeth for water-brooks,
So longeth my soul for thee, O God.

Ps. 123/2 As the eyes of servants (look) to the hand of their master,
As the eyes of a handmaid to the hand of her mistress,
So our eyes (look) unto the Lord our God.

Many are the passages in which Parallelism may safely be trusted for guidance in correcting the Massoretic Text; the Psalter and the Book of Proverbs especially present an extensive field, but only a few instances can be selected here.

Plainly, there is a want of harmony between the two halves of Prov. 10/7, which run thus in their received form:

The memory of a just man is blessed,
But the name of unrighteous ones will rot.

Rectification is attained, however, by changing the closing term יִרְקָב, into its resemblant יִגֹּקַב ('will be accursed').

A simple translation of Ps. 10/12 is the following:—

Arise, O Lord! O God, lift up thy hand!
Forget not afflicted ones!

As the middle clause, however, אַל נִשָּׂא יָדֶךָ shows little harmony with the last, it should be recast thus אַל יִנָּשֶׂה דָךְ 'let not the crushed one be forgotten'.

There is good reason for suspecting the correctness of Ps. 75/10, which in its received form gives the following sense:—

I will declare for ever;
I will sing praise to the God of Jacob.

But if the text of the first line, אַגִּיד לְעוֹלָם be changed to its resemblant אָגִיל בְּעֶלְיוֹן 'I will exult in the Most High', the whole runs smoothly.

Ps. 88/2, in its received form, entirely differs from all that follows in showing no parallelism, and requires not a little constraint to make it present an acceptable meaning.

O Lord, God of my salvation,
(in the) day have I cried, in the night before thee.

Rectification, however is secured by following Bickell and others in changing אֱלֹהֵי יְשׁוּעָתִי יוֹם into אֵלֶיךָ שִׁוַּעְתִּי יוֹמָם, and then dividing the verse so as to run thus:—

O Lord, unto thee have I cried in the day time;
I have called out in the night before thee.

There is an obvious want of balance in the received text of Prov. 28/26:—

He that trusteth in his own heart (is) a talkative fool[1],
But he that walketh in wisdom shall be delivered.

But by changing כְּסִיל at the end of the first line, into the resemblant יִכָּשֵׁל ('shall stumble'), this completely harmonises, in form and sense, with the verb at the end of the second.

Little satisfaction can be felt with the traditional text

---

1) See the writer's Studies in Hebrew Synonyms, page 29.

of Prov. 3/32, which may be rendered thus:—

A crafty man is an abomination to the Lord;
But his secret is with upright men.

One fails to find the expected contrast between the two lines; but by modifying the latter half of the verse so that וְאֶת יְשָׁרִים סודו may become וְאֶת יָשָׁר חַסְדּוֹ 'but His favour (is) with an upright man', a more fitting antithesis is secured.

The received form of Prov. 10/9 likewise displays a want of the contrast expected:—

He who walketh in integrity walketh confidently;
But he who perverteth his ways is made known.

Harmony, however, is restored by changing the concluding verb-form יִוָּדֵעַ into its resemblant יִרָּעִיד ('trembleth').

Amos 6/4 end. The closing form מַרְבֵּק shall be מִמֶּרְבָּק ('out of a flock') as a fitting correlative of מִצֹּאן at the close of the preceding clause. Ps. 72/9 for צִיִּים read צָרִים ('adversaries') already given on page a/81. Ps. 22/20, the unique and inexplicable form אֵילוּתִי, read אֱלֹהַי ('my God') to harmonise with the preceding יְהוָה. Isa. 24/11 the last clause runs 'the most of the land is gone into captivity'; the correlative verb in preceding clause should then be עָבְרָה ('has passed away'),— not עָרְבָה ('has grown dark, in erring twilight'). Isa. 2/10. The idea of hiding presented in the second clauselet requires that the weak verb-form בּוֹא at the beginning should be changed to הַחְבֵּא ('hide thee'). Ps. 89/14 (latter part). To accord with תָּרוּם, the form תְּעֹז in the preceding clause should be תַּעַל (shortened form of תַּעֲלֶה).

In Ps. 89/17, forming part of an address to the Lord regarding those who know Him, the Received Hebrew Text does not show, in the verbs of the two clauses, the parallelism expected.

In thy name shall they exalt all the day.
And in thy righteousness shall they be on high.

But by changing יָרוּמוּ, at the end of the verse, into יָרֹנּוּ ('they shall shout for joy'), harmony is effected.

The two lines of Ps. 77/10, as given in the received text, do not quite harmonise, and can at best be rendered.

Hath God forgotten (his) mercies?

Or hath He shut up, in anger, His compassion?

Harmony is restored by changing the first verb-form שָׁכַח into the resemblant חָשַׂךְ ('restrained').

Zeph. 1/10 picturing the calamities to come on Jerusalem contains three consecutive parallel clauses, telling of.

The sound of a cry for help from the fish-gate,

And wailing from the second quarter (of the city),

And great crashing from the hills.

The leading nouns in each clause being צְעָקָה, יְלָלָה and שֶׁבֶר respectively; the last of these, however, is not in line with the other two and may safely be regarded as having been mistranscribed for the resemblant שֶׁוַע ('a cry of distress').

Ps. 17/1 contains three brief parallel clauses which must have originally been identical in construction, each being formed of an imperative followed by a feminine noun with the suffix of the first person singular; the first clause, however, now marked by the Note-line, has suffered in transcription, and is now in line with the others. The triplet runs thus, according to the Massoretic Text:—

Hear righteousness;

Listen to my shouting;

Give ear to my prayer.

Every difficulty is removed if צֶדֶק be changed to צַעֲקָתִי, in the first line, which then means 'Hear my cry'.

7. ALPHABETICAL POEMS AS A GUIDE IN EMENDATION.

In the poetical parts of Scripture, there are found some acrostic compositions in which consecutive lines, or even a number of consecutive lines, have been framed in such a way that the initial word begins with the letters of the Hebrew alphabet in succession. A notable case is the 119th. Psalm, which presents 22 consecutive groups of eight lines, each commencing with the same letter (א, ב, ג, ד etc.); this piece of composition has been so well preserved in transmission that, even in the body of the work, few emendations of the text are required, and none as regards the initial letter of each line. The Book of Lamentations, also, except the last Chapter, contains similar acrostic poems; in Chapters 1, 2, and 3, each stanza consists of 3 lines, the first of which shows the alphabetical arrangement[1], while Chapter 4 presents two-line stanzas; the text requires considerable emendation.

Psalms 9 and 10 were originally one, and must thus be considered together; externally and internally, the whole has suffered much in the course of transcription. The stanzas, each consisting of two lines, beginning with א, ב, and ג, have been preserved; but the ד section has disappeared and seems now irrecoverable; the ה section cannot confidently be determined. There is likewise room for doubt where the ו stanza begins; but on the assumption that this commences at verse 10, the Psalm, from this point on to verse 17, inclusive, presents four stanzas (ו, ז, ח, ט) similar in form to those at the beginning, whereas verses

---

1) In Chapter 3, however, for some reason or other, the פ section precedes the ע stanza.

18 and 19 are stanzas (י and כ) half the length of those which precede. Verses 20 and 21 (beginning with ק and ש respectively) may be regarded as a later addition, placed there as a fitting finish to what precedes, after the Psalm, in its original form, has been divided. The first verse of what is now, in the Massoretic Text, Psalm 10 (beginning with לָמָּה), has been regarded as forming the ל stanza of the original; this is possible, but certainly stanzas מ, נ, ס, ע, פ and צ are not to be founa, despite ingenious conjectures of eminent critics. Up till the end of verse 11, difficulties abound in the Massoretic Text; but firmer ground is reached in verses 12, 13, where the ק stanza emerges, followed by ר in verse 14, ש in 15, 16, while ת forms the conclusion in verses 17, 18. The state of the received text in these two Psalms reconnected is such that the alphabetical arrangement gives little help in recovering the original.

In Psalm 25, the alphabetic arrangement has been maintained, except at a few points, and the text otherwise fairly preserved. The opening line, beginning of course with א, is too short as compared with others which follow, and should include the word אֱלֹהַי which, in the Massoretic Text, appears at the beginning of verse 2; when this strayed term is restored to its proper place, the next word בְּךָ fitly begins the second stanza. What now forms the ה stanza, (verse 5) is too long; the redundant portion is most probably the latter half of the ו stanza, thus left unrepresented except by this fragment; there seems to be no means available for restoring the missing first part. Subsequent verses maintain the alphabet arrangement until we reach verse 18, when a word beginning with ק should appear, but where, instead, we find the word רְאֵה, which also, fitly enough, begins the ר stanza; to find an entirely suitable term (which should be an imperative) for the beginning of verse 18 is extremely difficult, but choice may be made among קְחֵה

(Piel imperative 'blunt', i. e. 'alleviate') and קָצַר ('shorten', i. e. 'lessen'), and קָשַׁב ('attend to'), and קָדַם ('anticipate'), The concluding verse (22) of this Psalm, as given by the Massoretes, is a late addition, as the alphabetic arrangement ends with the verse before (the ת stanza).

Psalm 34 presents a regular and complete alphabetic arrangement, except that the ו stanza (between verses 6 and 7) is wanting.

In Psalm 37, alphabetic arrangement is nearly complete; a few of the stanzas, however, (ד and כ), have been shortened, while others (ח, נ and ת) have been extended. In the middle of verse 28, it is necessary to restore such a plural form as עָוְלִים or עַוָּלִים ('dishonest men') before the resemblant לְעוֹלָם in order to obtain the initial required for the ע stanza.

Ps. 145 is another alphabetic poem, complete with the exception of the נ stanza, which a late Hebrew transcriber has inadvertently omitted; but this can be restored through retranslation from the Septuagint[1] and the Peshito.

The foregoing remarks regarding some alphabetic poems in the Hebrew Scriptures will have in some measure prepared the way for considering another in the Book of the Prophet Nahum, which is unfortunately incomplete and has suffered very much in transcription. Several attempts have been made by critics[2] to recover the original text; in this search, endeavour must be made, in the first instance, by bearing in mind the alphabetic arrangement of the stanzas, to discover where each of these begins, and then to amend the text in accordance with general principles.

The beginning of each stanza, however, may now

---

1) See the next Chapter, page 271.

2) Special mention may be made of Bickell, Nowack, Marti, J. M. P. Smith, Haupt.

be indicated. The א stanza, comes first; the ב stanza commences with בְּסוּפָה in the middle of verse 3; the ג stanza with גּוֹעֵר at the beginning of verse 4. The beginning of the ד stanza is fixed by assuming that אֻמְלַל in the middle of verse 4 is a transcriptional error for דָּלַל; the ה stanza commences with הָרִים (or rather הֶהָרִים) at the opening of verse 5, and the ו stanza with וַתִּשָּׂא in the midle of the same verse. The ז stanza begins with the second word in verse 6, viz. וַעֲמוֹ,—for the form לְפָנַי, preceding this in the Massoretic Text, properly belongs to the line before, where it is to be restored to its original form לְפָנָיו ('before him'). The beginning of the ח and the ט stanzas is at once recognised in חֲמָתוֹ (middle of verse 6) and טוֹב (beginning of verse 7); while the י stanza opens with יֹדֵעַ (changed, however, to יוֹשִׁיעַ), now appearing near the end of verse 7; the כ stanza commences with כָּלָה, the third word in verse 8. Subsequent letters are more difficult to trace, but there is obviously a complete break at the end of verse 11. The latter portion of this alphabetic poem has been lost.

8. ANCIENT VERSIONS AS HELPS.

There remains for consideration the place to be assigned, as well as the value to be attached, for correcting the Massoretic Text, to translations from the original Hebrew. For the sake of brevity and clearness, it is advisable to indicate at once how these Versions are to be dealt with, so that the end in view may be attained as fully and speedily as possible.

1. Let it first, then, be observed that as our great object is to reach beyond the Received Hebrew Text, with its acknowledged defects, and to get nearer the originals penned by the different writers, only the

most ancient Versions, attesting pre-Massoretic readings, need be consulted. All modern translations, accordingly, even those which have been most carefully and completely executed, and which exhibit excellence of diction and spirit, must be wholly set aside, as they give no help in this line of research. Moreover, secondary translations (i. e. translations from translations, such as the Ethiopic and Slavonic, which were founded on the Septuagint) are even less valuable, as being still further removed from the original. We have thus practically to restrict ourselves to the examination of those Versions which were executed, at latest, in the early Christian Centuries, such as the Old Syriac and Jerome's Latin Version (as far as this is available), together with the Targums (or Aramaic renderings); and especially the still more ancient Version known as the 'Septuagint', a Greek translation of the entire Old Testament. The Samaritan is a minor Version of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua.

2. Secondly, it must be remembered that those more ancient Versions also, like the originals on which they were based, have themselves suffered at the hand of copyists and editors, and thus must themselves frequently be amended before serious and successful attempts can be made to utilise them[1].

3. Thirdly, the character of the Versions must be considered. These vary considerably in practical value as aids in correcting the Received Hebrew Text; some translators were fairly competent for their task, through adequate acquaintance with the original on the one hand, and with their own language on the other; but even within the same Version, and at different points in the same Book, striking differences in execution appear; for some parts

1) This remark applies especially to the Septuagint; see below.

have been well rendered, while wide departure from the sense of the Hebrew is only too evident in other passages[1].

(a) The Targums, though originating before the Christian Era[2] was merely transmitted orally at first; not till the first Century A. D. was commencement made in committing them to writing. They cannot be called 'translations', in the strict sense of this term, but are rather loose paraphrases, with which irrelevent comment is sometimes intermingled; they are thus of small value as witnesses for the exact Hebrew Text. The chief Targums are those bearing the names of Onkelos, on the Pentateuch; of Jonathan Ben-Uzziel on the Pentateuch, and on the Earlier and the Later prophets; there are also Targums on Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and other Books.

(b) A Syriac Version, of the Old Testament as well as the New, was made soon after the early followers of Jesus in Syria began to feel the need of having the Scriptures in their own tongue. Testimony is given by Ephraem, in the 4th. Century A. D., to this translation as having long been in use; he likewise states that the Old Testament was made for the Hebrews,—a fact confirmed by the Version itself, which distinctly breathes the spirit of the original. It is thus an important witness to the state of the pre-Massoretic Text[3].

---

1) Different chapters in the Septuagint of Isaiah present excellent illustrations of varying competence in the translators.

2) See Neh. 8/8.

3) In 1823, the British and Foreign Bible Society published an excellent edition prepared by Dr. Samuel Lee from the materials then available (several MSS. of the Old Testament generally and one of the Pentateuch, quotations in the writings of Syrian Christians, together with the Paris Polyglott and Walton's Polyglott); a reprint was

This early Version of the Old Testament is Syriac (usually designated the 'Peshito', or 'Peshitta', lit. simple) must carefully be distinguished from a later one, executed early in the sixth century by Paul of Tela, who based his work on the Old Greek Version as given by Origen in his 'Hexapla'[1]. Paul performed his task most carefully rendering each word with as much precision as possible; hence his Version, known as the Syro-Hexaplar, is valuable as a witness to the text of the Septuagint in his time[2].

(c) Latin Versions of the Scriptures originated in the North African Church[3], but so obscurely that little is known regarding them. It is certain, however, that the basis of this early translation was not the Hebrew original, but the Septuagint, and even this in unrevised form. As time went on, transcriptional errors increased to such an extent that revision became absolutely necessary; towards the close of the 4th. century the task was faced by the scholarly and indefatigable Jerome (died 420 A. D.), who, after (1) revising

---

issued from the American Mission Press in Urumiah in 1852. Much additional material, however, has since been discovered, which will doubtless be utilised in the preparation of a better edition.

1) This work, involving enormous industry was so named because it presented, in six parallel columns. (1) The Hebrew (unpointed) text of the Old Testament. (2) Transliterature of the Hebrew in Greek characters. (3) Aquila's translation. (4) The translation of Symmachus. (5) The Septuagint Version. (6) Theodotious translation; unfortunately, it has perished, except a few fragments.

2) An imperfect copy (containing the Later Prophets, the three Poetical Books, Daniel, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes) in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, has been photolithographed.

3) It must not be forgotten that, in the early Roman Church, and in the Church of Saul, during the first two Centuries, Greek, and not Latin, was commonly used.

the Old Latin Version of the New Testament, (2) revised the same Version of the Old Testament, on the basis of the Septuagint, but finally (3) made a New Version of the Old Testament on the basis of the Hebrew, on which he spent fourteen years. This work, in spite of imperfections through hasty execution in some parts, formed a noble service to the Church, in which it found gradual acceptance, though not readily in North Africa. In course of time, however, deterioration set in, frequently through resumption of errors from the early unrevised copies, so that the 'Latin Vulgate', long recognised by the Roman Church as authoritative, though often regarded as Jerome's Version, contains much that Jerome set aside; hence it does not occupy a high position as a witness for the pre-Massoretic Text. A movement has now begun within the Roman Church to secure a more faithful translation, in Latin, from the Hebrew.

(d) The Samaritan Version, still used by the small and rapidly disappearing community at Nablous, in Palestine, represents only the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, in a dialect akin to the Aramaic. Though normally written in characters more ancient than the modern ('square') Hebrew letters, its peculiar readings do not materially differ from their correlatives in the Massoretic Text, which, accordingly, it is but little fitted to improve. The oldest Samaritan MSS. cannot be dated earlier than the tenth Century A. D.

(e) The Septuagint (LXX.) is a translation prepared about the sound century B. C. for the numerous Greek-speaking Jews settled in Egypt and the neighbouring countries[1]. The several parts were finished at different times, and

---

[1] Little credence need be given to the story in the Letter of Aristaeus, that Ptolemy II (Philadelphus) requested the high-priest at Jerusalem to send him qualified interpreters to translate the Hebrew

show considerable variety as regards the competence of the Translators ; the Pentateuch is well rendered, and the Psalter fairly well done ; these were probably the first to be translated. The prophetical Books, particularly Jeremiah, show greater divergence form the present Hebrew Text ; the Book of Proverbs is frequently paraphrastic ; Daniel is so far removed from the original that, later, Theodotious'[1] translation had to be substituted. The style of the Greek is far from classical, but the closeness with which it generally reproduces Hebrew constructions frequently proves most serviceable in showing what is obviously the original reading from which the Massoretic text has sometimes diverged.

Unfortunately, however, the text of this Old Greek translation is still in an unsatisfactory state. Manifold transcription naturally involved increasing departure from the original form of the translation ; and even after a few centuries, such variety of readings was found to exist between different copies that the demand for a more reliable text became general throughout the Christian Church. But no combined action followed ; and steps were taken, instead, about the beginning of the fourth Century, in three different quarters, for the accomplishment of this desirable end. (a) At Caeserea, Pamphilus, and Eurebius, taking Origen's Hexaplastic text of the Septuagint as their basis, formed a recension which found general acceptance among the Churches in Palestine ; (b) Hesychius, working on the MSS.

Scriptures, and that each of the Seventy two (six from each Tribe) who came to Alexandria, after being shut up in the separate cells, produced Versions identical in every detail.

1) An invaluable handbook to the study of the Septuagint is H. B. Swete's Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge, 1900), new edition by R. L. Ottley, 1915.

current in Egypt, produced another recension which naturally found favour in Alexandria and the regions around[1]; while (c) Lucian, at Antioch, from the materials available there, formed a third recension which was accepted as the best by the Christians in Northern Syria, Asia Minor, and Constantinople[2]. Even these different recensions have since been commingled, and uncertainty regarding the correct text of the Septuagint has long prevailed[3].

To show the need of discrimination in using the Septuagint for the correction of the Massoretic Text, there will first be given a few illustrations of obvious corruptions in current editions of this Alexandrian Version ; it will next be shown that, notwithstanding such blemishes, this venerable work may frequently be utilised as a safe guide in recovering the original Hebrew.

---

1) The famous Vatican uncial, B. is generally regarded as having emanated from Egypt.

2) Lucian's recension is regarded by many critics as the nearest approach to the original form of the Septuagint Version ; the most serious attempt to recover it was made by Lagarde, who, however, was only able to publish about one half of its projected work (Librorum Vateris Testamenti Canonicorum pars prior ; Guttingae, 1883).

3) Common editions abound. But great advance was made through the publication of the Monumental work begun by Robert Holmes and finished by James Parsons (5 Vols. folios, Oxford 1798—1827) this gives the Roman text, with abundant Notes, readings from MSS., quotations from Patristic writers, etc. Later, A. C. F. von Tischendorf published four editions (1850—1869), each showing advance on its predecessor ; his work was continued by Eb. Nestle in other two editions (1875—1880). The convenient edition of H. B. Swete (3 vols. 8 ; Cambridge 1887—94) is being followed by the splendid quarto edition (Cambridge 1906 ff.) under the care of A. E. Brooks and N. Maclean.

In Ex. 17/6, the opening expression in the Hebrew text is הִנֵּנִי עֹמֵד ('Behold, I stand'), but the Greek Codices generally give ὅδε ἐγὼ ἕστηκα[1], though ὧδε ('here') is found in some copies; both forms, however, are obviously corruptions of ἴδε ('Behold'). In the middle of Jer. 36/6 (37/6 in the Hebrew Text), there occurs the form διότι ('because'), which, however, must originally have been διὰ τί ('wherefore ?') inasmuch as מַדּוּעַ, the corresponding term in Hebrew, alone suits the context. In Lam. 4/13, some Greek Codices exhibit the reading αἷμα δίκαιον ('righteous blood'), other have αἷμα ἀδίκων ('blood of unrighteous men'), but both are corruptions of αἷμα δικαίων, as the basal Hebrew is דַּם צַדִּיקִים ('the blood of righteous men'). In Ps. 47/10 (48/10 in Hebrew), there occurs the expression ἐν μέσω τοῦ λαοῦ σου ('in the midst of thy people'); but this is a transcriptional error for ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ναοῦ σου as shown by the original בְּקֶרֶב הֵיכָלֶךָ ('in the midst of thy temple'). In I. Sam. 14/5, describing a hilly region where a battle was fought between the Israelites and the Philistines, the opening expression in Greek is ἡ ὁδός ('the road'); that this, however, is a corruption of ὁ ὀδούς becomes evident on looking at the original Hebrew הַשֶּׁן (lit. 'the tooth') designating a sharp mountain-top[2].

The first word in the Septuagint Version of Isa. 54/3 is now ἔτι ('again', or 'still'), but this is a transcriptional error for ὅτι[3], inasmuch as the corresponding Hebrew כִּי

---

1) In this and other instances, it will be observed that substitution of similar sounds has been made.

2) Cf. the name of the Swiss mountain, 'la Dent du Midi'.

3) The substitution of one letter for another, in this and other cases, is due to similarity of form; in Greek, the Uncial letters E, O, C, also Λ, Δ, Λ, were specially liable to be mistaken, one for the other. The Book of Isaiah presents many instances of mistranscription in the Greek.

('because') alone suits the context; on the other hand, in the middle of Isa. 56/8 ὅτι should be ἔτι, inasmuch as the Hebrew עוֹד ('again') gives the sense required by the context. In Isa. 23/11, Βασιλεῖς ('Kings') is now found, instead of Βασιλείας, as the representative of מַמְלָכוֹת ('Kingdoms'); in Isa. 45/1, πόλεις ('cities') or πόλις ('city') now appears instead of the resemblant πύλαι, as the equivalent of שְׁעָרִים ('gates'). The expression ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ('in the desert'), near the beginning of Isa. 30/6, was formerly ἐν γῇ ἐρήμῳ ('in a desert land'), which represents בְּאֶרֶץ צִיָּה ('in a land of drought'), while the Massoretic Text shows בְּאֶרֶץ צָרָה ('in a hostile country'). In Isa. 53/8, there commonly appears αἴρεται ('he is carried away'), though some copies have ἦρθη or ἦχθη; but this must be a transcriptional error for κείρεται, which more fitly represents the corresponding term ('he is cut off') in the Hebrew נִגְזַר. In Isa. 33/14, ὑμῖν ('to you') has been mistaken for ἡμῖν, as the Hebrew is, appropriately, לָנוּ ('to us'); on the other hand, in 35/3, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν . . . . σώσει ἡμᾶς was originally, ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν . . . . σώσει ὑμᾶς, which correctly represents the Hebrew אֱלֹהֵיכֶם . . . יְשַׁעֲכֶם ('your God . . . will save you')[1].

Besides such divergences from the original as have now been indicated, there are other deviations in the Septuagint manifestly due to the Translators themselves, who sometimes omitted a word or clause, or even whole passages[2], but sometimes also added explanatory matter. At

---

[1] Confusion between the plural forms of the first and second personal pronouns is of frequent occurrence.

[2] The Greek Version of the Book of Job is considerably shorter than the present Hebrew Text, and some scholars hold that the former most nearly represents the original.—the additional portions found in Hebrew alone being regarded as amplifications by a later editor; other critics are of opinion that the shortness of the

other times their rendering is too paraphrastic to be regarded a translation, in the strict sense of this term. The venerable Version must thus, after all, be used with caution. But the experience gained through carefully comparing it with the Massoretic Text will prove the best training for profitable employment of the helpful readings it presents[1].

Secondly, a few examples will now be given of Septuagint readings which obviously indicate the original Hebrew, while debased and impracticable forms of these appear in the Massoretic Text.

Ps. 97/11 presents a strange statement in Hebrew אוֹר זָרֻעַ לַצַּדִּיק, for one cannot readily imagine how light can be 'sown' (as seed) for the righteous man; when we find, however, that the corresponding expression in the Alexandrian translation is φῶς ἀνέτειλε τῷ δικαίῳ ('light has arisen for the righteous'), it is safe to conclude that זָרֻעַ has been mistakenly substituted for זָרַח by the Hebrew scribe. A vague expression is found in the received Hebrew Text of Gen. 41/56 which tells how Joseph acted when the great famine in Egypt had begun; he opened 'all that was in them' (אֵת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶם); the corresponding reading in the Septuagint is πάντας τοὺς σιτοβολῶνας, which points to the Hebrew original, אֵת כָּל אֹצְרוֹת הַבָּר ('all the stores of grain'). At a later stage in the famine, when the Egyptians had no more money for buying grain out of the government stores, Joseph told them to bring their cattle, adding,

---

Alexandrian Text is due to omission. In the Book of Jeremiah, the order of the chapters in the Septuagint is sometimes strikingly different from that in the Massoretic Text.

1) See Swete's Introduction, Part II., chap. V. (The Septuagint as a Version), Part III. chap. IV. and VI. (The Greek Versions as aids to Biblical Study, and the Textual condition of the Septuagint, and problems arising out of it).

as recorded in Gen. 47/16, 'I will give to you in return for your cattle', the Massoretic reading being אֶתְּנָה לָכֶם בְּמִקְנֵיכֶם which obviously lacks an accusative to indicate what Joseph gave; on turning, however, to the corresponding expression in the Septuagint, δώσω ὑμῖν ἄρτους ἀντὶ τῶν κτηνῶν ὑμῶν, it becomes evident that a Hebrew transcriber has inadvertently omitted, after לָכֶם, the resemblant לֶחֶם ('bread'). Still later, in the account of the famine (47/21), when the people had been reduced to absolute poverty, the Massoretic Text relates regarding Joseph וְאֶת הָעָם הֶעֱבִיר אֹתוֹ לֶעָרִים ('and as for the people, he caused it to pass to the cities'), but no reason for such action is apparent; the Greek Version; however, removes the obscurity by indicating the original in its rendering, καὶ τὸν λαὸν κατεδουλώσατο αὐτῷ εἰς παῖδας, which may be taken to represent וְאֶת־הָעָם הֶעֱבִיד אוֹתוֹ לַעֲבָדִים ('and as for the people, he reduced them to bondage as servants'). In Ex. 19/18, where the Massoretic Text states that 'the mountain' (Sinai) trembled very much in fear, instead of הָהָר we must read, in accordance with the Septuagint, ὁ λαός, הָעָם ('the people'). In the Massoretic Text of I. Sam. 5/ 3, it is stated that after the image of Dagon had fallen down before the ark of the Lord, the Philistines 'took' it and restored it to its place; instead of וַיִּקְחוּ, however, the Septuagint correlative ἤγειραν points to a resemblant and more suitable form in Hebrew viz. וַיָּקִימוּ ('and they raised up'), which may safely be regarded as the genuine reading. Near the close of I. Sam. 9/16, the Lord is represented in the received Hebrew Text as having said to Samuel רָאִיתִי אֶת־עַמִּי ('I have seen my people'); such an expression, however, may well be regarded as rather bald, and hardly appropriate to the situation—; but the corresponding Alexandrian, viz. ἐπέβλεψα ἐπί τὴν ταπείνωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου, shows that a Hebrew scribe has inadvertently omitted, before עַמִּי, its resemblant עָנְיִי, which,

when, restored, gives a satisfactory meaning ('I have seen the distress of my people'). Difficulty has naturally been felt in Jer. 14/9 over the expression כְּאִישׁ נְדֻהָם, which has generally been supposed to mean 'like a man amazed' (or 'astounded'),but the unique participle is really a transcriptional error for the resemblant נִרְדָּם, attested by the Septuagint ὑπνῶν ('sleeping soundly').

CONCLUSION.

After carefully considering the various causes of departure from the original Hebrew Text, as indicated in the preceding pages, the student of the Old Testament, on meeting a difficulty, will have to ponder how he may most simply—with the least possible change—modify the traditional reading so as to make good sense. Guiding principles, to be applied as occasion requires,are briefly the following:—

1. Different vowel-signs may be attached to the Hebrew consonants (see page 4 ff.).

2. One of the vowel-letters (א, ה, ו, י) may be inserted or omitted as circumstances require (see page 8 ff.).

3. It may be sufficient to substitute one of the vowel-letters for another (see page 11 ff.).

4. Substitution, in a word, of a similarly sounded consonant may remove the difficulty (see page 13 ff.).

5. Substitution of a similarly sounded word may suffice to solve the difficulty (page 37 ff.).

6. Substitution of resemblant forms of letters—one or more—may recover the original reading (page 41 ff.).

7. The correct reading may be secured by trans-

p o s i n g the letters forming a word (see page 135 ff.).

8. Detachment of a letter from the beginning or end of one word, and its attachment to the word immediately adjoining, may correct a faulty reading (page 140 ff.).

9. Separation of one or more words from the beginning or end of one verse, and attachment to the verse immediately adjoining, may rectify a faulty text (see p. 145 ff.).

10. Inasmuch as one or two identical letters, immediately adjacent, but in different words, were apt to be omitted in transcription, correction of this 'haplography' is wholly justified. (see page 149 ff.).

11. Even letters u n l i k e others adjoining them were sometimes omitted by transcribers inadvertently, or because the writing which they copied had become dim, or because the MS. had otherwise suffered damage; the addition of a letter which satisfactorily solves a difficulty then becomes legitimate (see page 157 ff.).

12. As copyists might inadvertently omit a word or words, especially when these resembled other words adjacent, insertion of such words is justified, if the cause of thought thereby runs more smoothly (see page 162 ff.).

13. As inadvertent r e p e t i t i o n sometimes occurredeither dittography of single words (see page 166), or of a whole word (see page 174 ff.) or several words—removal of such disturbing redundancies becomes necessary.

14. When 'conflate' readings (see page 191) appear in a passage, removal of the inferior or incorrect reading is fully justified.

15. Glosses, or explanatory additions to the original text, were occasionally inserted by editors (see page 197), but not so frequently as is sometimes imagined. Veritable glosses, which usually betray themselves, might certainly be removed; but explanatory remarks may well have been penned by the original writer of prose narrative.

16. When the words have fused into one, this form is to be resolved into its original elements after carefully considering the requirements of the context (see page 201).

17. Unsatisfactory readings have sometimes arisen, through mistaken division of one word into two; careful consideration of the context may lead to discovery of the original form (see page 205).

18. When the same or cognate forms appear in proximity, and present a decided poverty of expression, the sameness is sometimes due to psychological influence on a transcriber who unconsciously assimilated the second form to the first which originally it merely resembled in form or sound; the genuine reading, at the second occurrence, may sometimes be discovered after careful study of the context (see page 206).

INDEX OF AUTHORS QUOTED.

	Page.
Abbot, T. K.	7
Aquila	71,221
Ball	167
Bardowicz, Leo	7
Baethgen	204
Bennet	204
Bickell	35,217
Bort	62,160
Briggs	204
Brooks, A. E.	224
Burney	204
Chwolson, D. Prof.	7
Cheyne	2,66,160
Cobbs, W. H. (F. N.)	209
Cooke, G. A.	35
Delitzsch	115,204
Driver	40,65,81
Duhm	160,185,204
Dyserinck	46,66,122
Euting	35
Ewald	127
Frankenberg	79
Gesenius	35
Girdlestone, R. B.	203,208
Grätz	38,40,57²,65,66,77,80,89,105,109,204

Page.
Haupt 217
Hesychuis 223
Hitzig 96,127,137
Jerome 221
Klostermann 40
Lagarde 36,224
Lee, Dr. Samuel 220
Lidzbarski, M. 35
Lowth, Bishop 209
Luccian 224
Macdonald, D. B. 16,31
Maclean, N. 224
Marti 217
Nestle, Eb. 224
Nowack 35,217
Olshausen 81
Origen 221,223
Ottley, R. L. 223
Parsons, Jas. 224
Paul of Tela. 221
Perles 36,55,59,138
Rashi 40
Smith, J. H. P. 217
Swete, H. B. 223,224,227
Symmachus 77,221
Theodotius 221
Tischendorf, A. C. F. von 224
Vodel, F. 203
Walton's Polyglott 220
Waie, Dr. 7
Wellhausen 61,63,65,78,96,185
Weir 40,81,95
Wright, W. 2,7

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES.

GENESIS.

CHAP. PAGE.

I, 1, 5, ... 183
I, 14 98
I. 24, 25 60
I, 30 148
I, 31 194
II, 2 194
II, 24 148
III, 1 134
III, 22 149
IV, 8 148
IV, 20 23
V, 3 194
VIII, 10, 21 115
VIII 22 151
IX, 11 135
IX, 20 79
X, 8* 14
XI, 3 32
XII, 19 146
XIII, 11 88
XIV, 10 85
XIV, 22 88
XIV, 24 100
XV, 13 50
XVI, 14 182
XVI, 12 55
XVII, 17 ..... 29, 154
XVII, 18 83
XVIII, 12, 13, 15. 29
XVIII, 18 182
XVIII, 19 123
XVIII, 20 96
XVIII, 21* 62
XVIII, 25 191
XIX, 2 146
XIX, 15 79
XIX, 25 191
XIX, 2 146
XIX, 15 79

GENESIS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XIX, 25 191
XIX, 33 191
XX, 12 62
XXI, 6 29
XXI, 23 146
XXII, 2 132
XXII, 17 33
XXII, 18 182
XXIII, 6 11
XXIII, 11 135
XXIII, 15 102
XXIII, 17 93
XXIV, 60 33
XXV, 20 146
XXV, 23 ..... 66. 182
XXVI, 4 182
XXVII, 22 105
XXVII, 29 182
XXVII, 42 22
XXVIII, 16 141
XXIX, 4, 5, 15, 25. 134
XXIX, 27 87
XXIX, 28 146
XXX, 4, 9 146
XXX, 11 165
XXX, 27 67
XXX, 30 64, 67, 194
XXX, 32 195
XXX, 34 83
XXXI, 23 43
XXXI, 25 79
XXXI, 27 7
XXXI, 32 80
XXXI, 36 175
XXXI, 39 164
XXXI, 40 114
XXXI, 44, 48, 52 ... 192
XXXI, 52 155
XXXI, 53 164

GENESIS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XXXII, 10 182
XXXII, 23* 133
XXXIII, 3 105
XXXIV, 8 146
XXXIV, 29 152
XXXV, 26 9
XXXVI, 15 ..... 63, 66
XXXVI, 40 112
XXXVII, 2 52
XXXVII, 3 138
XXXVII, 17 138
XXXVII, 20, 22, 24, 28 11
XXXVIII, 5 11
XXXVIII, 21 124
XXXIX, 5 21
XLI, 6, 23, 27..... 171
XLI, 51* 118
XLI, 40 22
XLI, 51 195
XLI, 56 ..... 67, 227
XLII, 1, 2 152
XLII, 6, 8, 10 167
XLII, 21 115
XLII, 22 ..... 134, 192
XLIII, 7, 27, 29 ... 134
XLIV, 15, 19 134
XLIV, 18 ..... 27, 142
XLVI, 27 9
XLVI, 32 11
XLVII, 3 11
XLVII, 16 ... 8, 143, 228
XLVII, 21 228
XLVII, 24 167
XLVII, 22 139
XLVIII, 19 145
XLIX, 9 137
XLIX, 29 92
XLIX, 25 92

GENESIS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XLIX, 30 93
XLIX, 32 93

EXODUS.

II, 6 133
II, 14 ..... 91, 141
II, 21 146
III, 7 181
IV, 10, 13 ..... 27, 142
IV, 31 33
V, 1 181
V, 5 14
V, 7, 14 92
V, 9 ..... 108, 139
V, 12 92
V, 16 ..... 82, 146, 166
V, 23 21
VIII, 11 ... 11, 153, 192
VIII, 19 139
VIII, 20* 9
VIII, 23 173
IX, 14 ..... 83, 120
IX, 23 18
IX, 24 ..... 124, 143
X, 10 21
X, 17 127
X, 21 97
XI, 1 ..... 41, 195
XII, 12 63
XII, 44 98
XII, 48 167
XIII, 21, 22 151
XIII, 22 106
XIV, 10 152
XIV, 19 ..... 16, 103
XIV, 21 ..... 32, 33
XIV, 28 44
XIV, 31 8
XV, 1, 21 61
XV, 2 ..... 20, 81
XV, 7 ..... 53, 95
XV, 11, 6 16
XV, 13 ..... 71, 89
XV, 16 167
XV, 25 8
XVI, 10 192
XVI, 29 38
XVII, 6 225
XVIII, 2 111
XVIII, 6 12

EXODUS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XVIII, 22 124
XVIII, 23 115
XVIII, 24 99
XIX, 9 228
XIX, 18 97
XIX, 22, 24 71
XIX, 25 149
XX, 1, 17 203
XXI, 2, 26, 27 75
XXI, 8 ..... 11, 181
XXI, 33 11
XXI, 35 118
XXI 36 68
XXII, 5* 39, 82 97
XXII, 10 89
XXII, 12 164
XXII, 24 158
XXII, 30 164
XXIII, 3 107
XXIII, 5 47
XXIII, 7 52
XXIII, 24 95
XXIV, 7 28
XXV, 39 82
XXVI, 18 163
XXVI, 31 82
XXVIII, 42 42
XXIX, 1 34
XXX, 3 40
XXXI, 34 14
XXXI, 1 34
XXXII, 2 13
XXXII, 4 135
XXXII, 12 61
XXXII, 16 31
XXXII, 27 43
XXXII, 31 11
XXXIII, 9 106
XXXIII, 11 112
XXXIII, 12* 123
XXXIII, 22 84
XXXIV, 7 172
XXXIV, 13 109
XXXVI, 3 27
XXXVII, 26 40
XXXVIII, 9 163
XXXVIII, 13 163

LEVITICUS.

V, 1 ..... 41, 196

CHAP. PAGE.

LEVITICUS.

V, 8 95
V, 15 ..... 23, 114
V, 16 ..... 23, 114
V, 22 ..... 38, 64
V, 23 38
VII, 19 91
VII, 24 164
VII, 35 101
VIII, 4 34
X, 17 192
XI, 37, 38 118
XI, 42 68
XIII, 3, 4, 10, 20 ... 132
XIV, 6 157
XIV, 45 109
XIV, 48 159
XV, 31 8
XVI, 2 102
XVI, 13 101
XVII, 15 164
XVIII, 12 119
XIX, 19 77
XIX, 20 68
XIX, 23 106
XIX, 26 196
XX, 19 119
XXI, 4 24
XXI, 6 63
XXII, 8 164
XXII, 24 196
XXII, 27 65
XXIII, 17 196
XXV, 22 182
XXV, 30 95
XXVI, 33, 38, 45 ... 182
XXVII, 12 150

NUMBERS.

I, 47 111
II, 3 163
II, 33 11
III, 3 157
IV, 18 48
IV, 19 134
IX, 16 106
IX, 20 155
X, 34 102
X, 35 ..... 206, 208

NUMBERS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XI, 2 78
XI, 11 8
XI, 15 80
XI, 29 181
XI, 30 184
XI, 31,..... 20, 45, 72*, 86, 187
XI, 32 123
XI, 46 34
XII, 6 167
XII, 8 13
XII, 11 27
XII, 13 11
XII, 14 ..... 37, 196
XIV, 4 ..... 98, 197
XIV, 9 135
XIV, 17 118
XIV, 23 88
XIV, 25, 44, 45 ... 32
XIV, 31 193
XV, 39 27
XVI, 2 116
XVI, 3 34
XVI, 5 198
XVI, 34 107
XVII, 11 ..... 33, 34
XVII, 28 157
XVIII, 5 34
XVIII, 8 101
XVIII, 21, 31 107
XIX, 3 62
XIX, 6 95
XX, 2 34
XXI, 28, 29 207
XXI, 32 50
XXIII, 3 40
XXIII, 9 ..... 47, 63
XXIII, 10 165
XXIII, 15 86
XXIV, 8 68
XXIV, 9 137
XXIV, 13 101
XXIV, 16 153
XXIV, 17 16
XXV, 1, 5 87
XXV, 4 32
XXV, 6* 97* 176
XXV, 15 182

NUMBERS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XXV 25 F.N. 15
XXV, 32 9
XXVI, 62 111
XXVII, 11 119
XXVII, 14 166
XXXI, 8 43
XXXI, 23 39
XXXI, 29 155
XXXII, 42 76
XXXIII, 4 63
XXXIII, 9 63
XXXIII, 27, 28 76
XXXV, 18 63
XXXV, 30 82

DEUTERONOMY.

I, 5 119
I, 12 86
I, 22 111
I, 42 18
II, 12 51
III, 20 147
III, 26 115
IV, 19 98
IV, 31 119
IV, 34 27
V, 6, 21 203
V 28* 64
VI, 11 11
VI 11, 13 106
VI, 19 32
VI 22 9
VII, 5 109
VII, 6 181
VII, 16 113
VII, 17 85
VII, 18 32
VII, 19 .... 9, 26, 110
XI 13, 22 149
XI, 22 28
XII, 15 19
XIV, 2 24
XV, 7 198
XV, 14 198
XVI, 5 ..... 33, 198
XVI, 18 ..... 98, 198
XVII, 2 ..... 33, 193
XVII, 8 161

DEUTERONOMY.

CHAP. PAGE.

XVIII, 11 91
XIX, 9 29
XX, 14 33
XXI, 14 98
XXIV, 7 87
XXIV, 14 ..... 74, 159
XXV, 9* 122
XXV, 17 156
XXVI, 3 49
XXVI, 13 122
XXVI, 18 24
XXVII, 8 119
XXVII, 9 33
XXVIII, 1 149
XXVIII, 32 181
XXVIII, 58 29
XXIX, 2 27
XXIX 19 91
XXXI, 12 29
XXXII, 7 208
XXXII, 24 20
XXXII, 34 93
XXXII, 36 208
XXXIII, 29 41
XXXIII, 20 137
XLII, 22 106
XLV, 24 106

JOSHUA.

I, 2 163
I, 4 163
I, 8 112
I, 15 147
II, 1, ... 141
II, 2, 3 111
II, 3 163
II, 4 141
II, 8 172
II, 11 120
III, 8 13
III, 11, 14, 17 164
III, 16 ..... 163, 190
III, 17 182
IV, 1 182
IV, 18 ..... 42, 190
V, 1 ..... 94, 120, 190
V, 6 168
V, 8 182

JOSHUA.

CHAP. PAGE.

VI, 9 190
VI, 11 160
VI, 15 42
VII, 1 100
VII, 5 120
VIII, 11 164
X, 3 100
X, 21 151
X, 28 62
XI, 19 126
XIV, 10 21
XV, 13, 19, 63 203
XV, 18 ..... 101, 154
XV, 19 166
XV, 49 99
XVI, 10 203
XVII, 11, 13 203
XVIII, 11 62
XVIII, 13 84
XIX, 47 39
XIX, 50 203
XXI, 15, 39 204
XXI, 18 204
XXII, 12, 16, 17, 18. 173
XXIV, 28, 31 203
XXIV, 30 203

JUDGES.

I, 7 ..... 98, 192
I, 10, 15, 20, 21, 27, 29 203
I, 11 99
I, 14 ..... 101, 154
I, 15 166
I, 35 96
II, 6, 9 203
II, 15 130
II, 22 82
III, 26 73
IV, 11 55
IV, 18 88
V, 5 ..... 18, 91
V, 20 103
V, 31 67
VI, 5* 56*, 66
VI, 8 20
VI, 18 112
VI, 25* 15

JUDGES.

CHAP. PAGE.

VI, 26 71
VI, 27 151
VI, 30, 31, 32 109
VII, 3 64
VII, 19 133
VII, 21 110
VII, 22 152
VII, 5, 6, 7 34
VIII, 6 13
VIII, 16 109
IX, 6 199
IX, 31 199
X, 12 57
X, 18 51
XI, 10 78
XI, 39 43
XII, 2 16
XIII, 12 138
XIV, 15 ..... 37, 111
XIV, 17 105
XVI, 3 96
XVI, 9, 12 109
XVI, 25 168
XVI, 25, 27 29
XVII, 3 56
XVIII, 8 131
XVIII, 22 43
XIX, 11 10
XIX 30 139
XX, 13 143
XX, 15 17 111
XX, 33 117
XX, 38 162
XX, 45 43
XXI, 9 111

1st SAMUEL.

I, 1 113
I, 24 100
II, 1 20
II, 14 85
II, 16 145
II, 24 199
III, 13 140
IV, 2 ..... 23, 78
IV, 3 90
IV, 13 55
V, 3 ..... 73, 228

1st SAMUEL.

CHAP. PAGE.

VI, 18 ..... 89, 192
IX, 16 228
IX, 16 144
IX, 19* 62
IX, 28 72
X, 5, 10 91
X, 11 72
X, 19 145
X 24 54
X, 27 64
XI, 6 42
XI, 9* 42
XI, 14, 17 53
XII 3 66
XIII * 13
XIII, 1 148
XIII, 8 144
XIII, 14* 24
XIV, 5 225
XIV, 9 57
XIV, 22 43
XIV, 23 33
XIV, 26 40
XIV, 27 35
XIV, 32 23
XIV, 33 79
XIV, 40 59
XIV, 47 59
XV, 18 113
XVI, 4 134
XVII, 7 22
XVII, 8 139
XVII, 17 133
XVII, 32 51
XVII, 52 39
XVII, 53 175
XVIII, 10 192
XVIII, 22 ..... 8, 13
XIX, 20 122
XX, 25 140
XX, 30 125
XX, 38 174
XX, 40 113
XXI, 5 162
XXI, 7 ..... 59, 107
XXI, 8 ..... 28, 104
XXI, 14 54
XXI, 16 134

1st SAMUEL.

CHAP. PAGE.

XXII, 8 81
XXII, 9 59
XXIII, 16 183
XXIV, 18 135
XXV, 8 ..... 8, 141
XXV, 15, 16 129
XXV, 17, 25 13
XXV, 31 200
XXV, 37 120
XXVI, 15 92
XXVI, 22 153
XXVII, 1 115
XXVIII, 2 13
XXVIII, 3 184
XXVIII, 9 135
XXVIII, 24 123
XXXI, 9 35

2nd SAMUEL.

I, 6 43
I, 10 11
I, 14 24
I, 16 66
I, 19 ... 10, 17*, 61, 200
I, 21 ..... 42, 145, 155
I. 22 26
I, 24 ..... 103, 132, 172
I. 26 161
II, 1 192
II, 3 31
II, 9 13
III, 7 148
III, 18 11
III, 29 13
VI, 3 ..... 14, 133
VI, 3, 4 157
VI, 20 26
VII, 23 152
VII, 7 14
VII, 20 13
VII, 23 59
VIII, 3 ..... 29, 58
VIII, 13 59
X, 16 ..... 14, 46
XI, I 8
XI, 25 45
XII, 1 8
XII, 18 ..... 68, 200

2nd. SAMUEL.

CHAP. PAGE.

XIII, 14 24
XIII, 33 156
XIV, 5 67
XIV, 16 ... 83, 120, 124
XV, 24 16
XVI, 4 21
XVI, 17 134
XVIII, 30* 86
XVIII, 9 89
XVIII, 13 29
XVIII, 19 89
XVIII, 20 143
XVIII, 29 134
XIX, 43 43
XIX, 32 40
XIX, 38 200
XX, 14 122
XXI, 2 21
XXI, 8* 28
XXII 204, 206
XXII, 1 181
XXII, 12 ..... 86, 124
XXII, 15* 63
XXII, 22 107
XXII, 34 155
XXII, 42 142
XXIII, 13 18
XXIII, 23 28
XXIII, 33 86
XXIII, 35 99
XXIV, 13 105

1st. KINGS.

I, 6 167
I, 9, 19, 25 19
I, 11 112
I, 18 ..... 13, 170
I. 25 79
I, 43 115
I, 47 83
II, 8 21
II, 31 200
II, 44 120
IV, 13 51
VII, 40 83
VII, 45 122
VIII, 9 144
VIII, 30, 32, 34, 36,

1st. KINGS.

CHAP. PAGE.

39, 43 201
XI, 17, 19, 14, 21 ... 58
XI, 24 ..... 52, 54
XII, 33 53
XIII, 11 154
XIII, 12 4
XIV, 9 14
XIV, 31 62
XV, 20 55
XIX, 21 126
XIX 21 138
XX, 27 111
XX, 43* 84
XX, 43 96
XXI, 4 94
XXI 5 94
XXI, 21 136
XXI, 29 8
XXII, 49 64

2nd. KINGS.

II, 2 183
IV, 1, 40 20
IV, 14 115
V, 12 14
VI, 23 201
VI, 4 71
VII, 1 147
VII, 13 157
VII, 9, 11 201
IX, 4 157
IX, 15 99
XI, 1 152
XIII, 6 136
XIII, 7 ..... 95, 120
XIV, 7 ..... 59, 90
XIV, 10 84
XV, 29 56
XVI, 7 90
XVIII, 13 206
XIX, 26 207
XIX, 29 27
XX, 8 133
XX, 12 67
XX, 13 ..... 22, 207
XX, 19 206
XXIII, 11 83
XXIV, 1 100

2nd. KINGS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XXV, 1 100
XXV, 4 153

ISAIAH.

I, 7 ..... 10, 48
I, 9 ..... 80, 166
I, 13 38
I, 17 25
I. 20 134
I, 21 10
I, 25 14
I, 27 ..... 59, 56, 142
I, 28* 23*, 114
I, 29 82
II, 2 ..... 182, 207
II, 2, 4 183
II, 3 ..... 182, 207
II, 4 4
II, 5 133
II, 6 173
II, 9 178
II, 10 ..... 46, 121, 214
II, 16 178
II, 19 ..... 46, 121
II, 20 46
II, 21 121
III, 2 ..... 25, 47
III, 4 99
III, 6 ..... 70, 77
III, 7 111
III, 12 ..... 4, 17, 124
III, 13 96
III, 14 ..... 21, 47
III, 15 ..... 15, 163
III, 24 23
III, 25 141
IV, 4 ..... 81, 104
IV, 5 112
V, 2 147
V, 6 138
V, 9 .....71, 117, 143
V, 12 ..... 81, 206
V, 13 15
V, 14 ...53, 143, 171, 178
V, 17 ..... 15, 59
V, 18* 69*, 75, 185
V, 19 ..... 36, 53, 64
V, 24 ..... 132, 167

ISAIAH.

CHAP. PAGE.

V, 26 156
V, 29 53
V, 30 25
VI, 4 102
VI, 8 52
VI, 11 64
VI 12 64
VI, 12 22
VI, 13 177
VII, 1* 147
VII, 2 73
VII, 7 70
VII, 14 147
VII, 15 .....43, 44
VII, 16 .....43, 62
VII, 17 ...32, 88, 142, 164
VII, 20 ..... 82, 164
VII, 21, 22 43
VII, 22 22
VII, 24 144
VIII, 6 80
VIII, 8 127
VIII, 10 54
VIII, 12 25
VIII, 14 ..... 136, 177
VIII, 15 ..... 16, 142
VIII, 17 147
VIII, 19 ..... 56, 144
VIII, 23 55
IX, 1 18
IX, 2 ..... 11, 127, 179
IX, 3 ..... 21, 65
IX, 4* 80*
IX, 5 136
IX, 10 29
IX, 11 ..... 123, 183
IX, 13 179
IX, 17 179
IX, 19 ..... 5, 161
X, 1 ..... 13, 68
X, 2 91
X, 3 162
X, 4 173
X, 5 54
X, 8 153
X, 12 ..... 11, 110
X, 14 ..... 109, 179
X, 20 192

ISAIAH.

CHAP. PAGE.

X, 27 ..... 192, 201
XI, 1 17
XI, 4 13
XI, 11 114
XI, 15 44
XII, 2 20
XIII, 19 207
XIII, 20 142
XIII, 21 207
XIV, 5 9
XIV, 7 15
XIV, 17 45
XV, 2 44
XV, 5 169
XV, 9 44
XV, 3 108
XVI, 4 58
XVI, 6 207
XVI, 8 207
XVI, 10 207
XVI, 11 207
XVI, 12 ..... 65, 160
XVII, 1 106
XVII, 12 182
XVII, 13 ..... 101, 182
XVII, 14 ..... 152, 183
XVIII, 2 68
XVIII, 4 104
XVIII, 7 68
XIX, 13 ..... 30, 36
XXI, 4 ..... 76, 134
XXI, 5 21
XXI, 14 116
XXI, 15 ..... 48, 89
XXII, 8* 125
XXII, 13 26
XXII, 21 ..... 82, 186
XXIII, 8 41
XXIII, 11 226
XXIII, 12 20
XXIII, 13 106
XXIV 1 70
XXIV, 6 114
XXIV, 11 ... 70, 124, 214
XXIV, 17 207
XXIV, 18 207
XXIV, 23 6
XXV, 2 ..... 28, 59

ISAIAH.

CHAP.	PAGE.
XXV, 9	147
XXVI, 12	169
XXVI, 20	96
XXVII, 2	58
XXVIII, 2	24
XXVIII, 10	69
XXVIII, 16	74
XXVIII, 18	87
XXVIII, 22	115
XXIX, 5	20
XXIX, 6	25
XXIX 10	97
XXX, 4	94
XXX, 6	226
XXX, 27	96
XXXII, 10	32
XXXII, 13	77
XXXIII, 2	147
XXXIII, 12	17
XXXIII, 14 169, 185, 226	
XXXIII, 15	97, 185
XXXIII, 18	87
XXXIII, 24	77
XXXIV, 12	103
XXXV, 1	156
XXXV, 3	226
XXXV, 7	23
XXXVII, 1	206
XXXVII, 15	14
XXXVII, 18	94
XXXVII, 26	67
XXXVII, 27	207
XXXVII, 30 ... 27,	207
XXXVII, 39	206
XXXVIII, 12 ... 24,	174
XXXVIII, 13	24
XXXVIII, 17 ... 24,	175
XXXIX, 1	67
XXXIX, 2*	22
XXXIX, 2	207
XL, 1	153
XL, 4	168, 180
XL, 6	95
XL, 9 ... 93, 95, 101, 170,	171
XL, 10	20, 63, 180
XL, 11	37
XL, 15	80

ISAIAH.

CHAP.	PAGE.
XL, 17	103
XL, 21	19, 166
XL, 21*	64
XL, 23	90
XL, 24	51
XL, 31	106
XLI, 1	106
XLI, 12	103
XLI, 22	129
XLI, 24	103
XLI, 25	88
XLI, 29	103
XLII, 1, 3	38
XLII, 3	83
XLII, 4	12, 36
XLII, 10	61
XLII, 11	70
XLII, 15	38
XLII 19	126
XLIII, 4	13
XLIII, 22	115
XLIV, 5	134
XLIV, 8	29
XLV, 1	226
XLV, 8	50, 110
XLV, 20	39
XLVII, 3	52
XLVII, 6	36
XLVII, 7	55
XLVIII, 1	27
XLVIII, 16	13
XLIX, 1	182
XLIX 5,	11
L, 6	14
L, 10	63
L, 42	10
LI, 6	72
LI, 7	102
LI, 16	106
LI, 17	64
LI, 18	89
LI, 19	11
LI, 23	14
LII, 8	24
LII, 10	203
LIII, 2	44
LIII, 4	77
LIII, 8	138, 226

ISAIAH

CHAP.	PAGE.
LIII 10	36, 82
LIV, 10	78
LV, 1*	34
LVI, 8	226
LVI, 12	37
LVII, 1	14
LVII, 11	88
LVIII, 11	106
LVIII 14	37
LIX, 3	50
LX, 9	147, 169
LXIII, 1	53
LXIII, 2	150
LXIII, 3	87
LXIII, 19	91
LXIV, 2	91
LXV, 4	95
LXV, 5	105
LXV, 23	36
LXVI, 2	13
LXVI, 15	42
LXIX, 4	58

JEREMIAH.

I, 5	123
I, 18	83
II, 12	40
II, 20	58
II, 24	68
II, 24*	60
II, 25	33
II, 34	5, 162
III, 1	139, 165
III, 5	112
III, 8	89
III, 9*	24
III, 12	112
III, 29	17
IV, 4	9
IV, 10	133
IV,, 26	109
V, 1	39
V, 26	47
VI, 11	84, 173
VI, 16	133
VI, 20	153
VI, 28	52
VI, 29	109

JEREMIAH.

CHAP.	PAGE.
VII, 4	121
VII, 10	43
VII, 14	192
VII, 22	92
VIII, 10	18, 30, 121
VIII, 14	11
IX, 2	36
IX, 17	50
X, 2	13
X, 2	92
X, 4	79, 81
X, 7	65
X, 9*	72
X, 11	28
X, 12	207
X, 13	206, 207
X, 16	207
X, 19	64, 169
X, 25	159, 206, 207
XI, 11	20
XI, 12	20
XI, 19	121, 133
XII, 4	124
XII, 6	36, 84
XII, 12	133
XII, 16	155
XIV, 2	70
XIV, 5	136
XIV, 9	53, 229
XIV, 21	87
XV, 19	70
XVI, 7	17
XVI, 14	207
XVI, 15	207
XVII, 11	126
XVIII, 17	5
XIX, 16	136
XX, 8	99
XX, 8	99
XX, 16	101
XX, 20	20
XXI 12	39, 111
XXII, 17	112
XXII, 20	20
XXIII, 2	171
XXIII, 5	207
XXIII, 8	207
XXIII, 19	26

JEREMIAH.

CHAP.	PAGE.
XXIII, 23	126
XXIII, 26	127
XXIII, 29	17
XXIII, 33	126
XXV, 15	64
XXV, 31	53
XXV, 32	26
XXVI, 2	105
XXVI, 6	12
XXVI, 9	12
XXVI, 10	23, 105
XXIX, 8	152
XXXI, 1	93
XXXI, 7	37
XXXI, 8	46
XXXI, 11	100
XXXI, 12	5
XXXI, 14	94
XXXI, 18	58
XXXI, 22	150
XXXI, 29	208
XXXI, 31	40
XXXI, 32	87
XXXI, 37	143
XXXII, 7	148
XXXII, 8	164, 148
XXXII, 9	148
XXXII, 23	140
XXXII, 35	136
XXXII, 39	59, 87
XXXIII, 14	13, 207
XXXIII, 16	207
XXXIII, 20	151
XXXIII, 20, 21	87
XXXIII, 35	151
XXXIV, 12	164
XXXVI, 22	30
XXXVI, 6*	225
XXXVII, 12	109
XXXVII, 19	60
XXXIX, 1, 11	100
XLI, 9	116
XLII, 16*	43
XLIV, 14	165
XLIV, 12	70
XLVI, 20	157
XLVI, 21	123
XLVIII, 2	33, 175

JEREMIAH.

CHAP.	PAGE.
XLVIII, 7	66
XLVIII, 19	207
XLVIII, 31	11
XLVIII, 33	207
XLVIII, 36	207
XLVIII, 43	207
XLVIII, 44	207
XLVIII, 45	207
XLVIII, 46	207
XLIX, 7	107, 207
XLIX, 9	29
XLIX, 10	207
XLIX, 12	207
XLIX, 16	207
XLIX, 19	80, 133, 207
XLIX, 21	207
XLIX, 33, 36	207
L, 2	27, 142
L, 21	45
L, 34	145
L, 39	207
L, 40	207
L, 44	207
L, 46	207
LI, 3	157
LI, 9	110
LI, 15	207
LI, 19	207
LI, 44	27

EZEKIEL.

I, 4	124
I, 14	72
III, 13	192
IV, 16	23
V, 14	180
V, 16	23
VII, 4, 3, 8	168
VII, 9	133
VII, 19	208
VII, 23	23
VIII, 6	165
VIII, 11	175
IX, 2, 3, 11	26
IX, 6	105
XII, 16	155
XIII, 14	15
XVI, 59	87

EZEKIEL.

CHAP.	PAGE.
XVII, 9	109
XVII, 15, 18, 19	87
XVIII, 2	208
XVIII, 25	88
XIX, 7	91
XXI, 20	39
XXI, 25	14
XXII, 28	67
XXIII, 35	14
XXIV, 17, 22	22
XXIV, 27	92
XXVI, 4, 12	15
XXVI, 15	192
XXVI, 16	22
XXIX, 18	100
XXXII, 29	16
XXXIII, 17, 20	88
XXXIV, 29*	23, 33
XXXVII, 16	34
XXXVIII, 15	151
XXXVIII, 20	18
XL, 5	122
XI, 8	157
XL, 17, 45	89
XLII, 16	122
XLIII, 13	40
XLVII, 13	50
XLVII, 17, 18, 19	35
XLVII, 19	98
XLVIII, 16	157

HOSEA.

II, 1	172
II, 2	172
II, 4	172
II, 8	18
II, 14	41, 63
III, 4	80
V, 1	172
V, 6	109
V, 11	29
VI, 8	55
VI, 9	69, 91
VII, 2	79
VII, 6	64
VII, 8	64, 40
VII, 14	94
VII, 16	35

HOSEA.

CHAP.	PAGE.
VIII, 14	67
IX, 2	62
IX, 12	26
IX, 13	88
IX, 14	88
X, 2	61
X, 5	15
X, 6	102
X, 14	36, 58
X, 15	174
XI, 4	185
XI, 8	19
XII, 6	66
XIII, 2	13, 66
XIII, 10	28, 104
XIII, 12	47

AMOS.

I, 1	117
I, 11*	59
I, 11	16
II, 11	74
III, 6	63
III, 8	74
III, 11	123
III, 14	172
III, 15	57
IV, 7	17
IV, 8	106
IV, 9	139
IV, 10	57
IV, 13*	15
V, 1	130
V, 2	31, 130
V, 14	21, 80
V, 15	36
V, 24	50
VI, 3	24, 30
VI, 4	123, 214
VI, 8	51
VI, 10	161
VI, 11*	68
VII, 1	39, 59
VII, 2	134
VII, 5	134
VII, 9	45
VII, 14	17, 44
VII, 16	155

AMOS.

CHAP.	PAGE.
VIII, 4	103
VIII, 8	59, 108, 142
VIII, 9	82
VIII, 10*	77
VIII, 10	65
VIII, 11	155
VIII, 14	17
IX, 1	73
IX, 2	55, 75
IX, 3, 4	152
IX, 12	55, 142

JOEL.

I, 7	33, 175
I, 10	171
I, 12	50
I, 13	12
I, 16	168
I, 18	127
II, 1	128
II, 2	110, 128
II, 6	139
II, 8	15, 58
II, 9	202
II, 17	139, 208
II, 23	114
III, 13	133
IV, 21	80

OBADIAH.

I, 1	207
I, 5	29
I, 6	207
I, 8	207
I, 9	207
I, 11	20
I, 14	109
I, 16	207
I, 21	44

JONAH.

I, 4	26
I, 7*	43
I, 9	173
I, 12	76
I, 16	174
I, 17	43
II, 3	14, 44
II, 10	168

MICAH.

CHAP. PAGE.

I, 2 142
I, 3 110
I, 4 78
I, 8 66
I, 9* 17
I, 10 ..... 27, 84, 142
I, 12 84
I, 14 55
II, 2 52
II, 5 85
II, 8 30
III, 4 ..... 67, 71
III, 8 ..... 10, 125
IV, 1, 3 ..... 182, 207
IV, 2 ..... 182, 203
IV, 2 ..... 182, 207
IV, 14 F. N. 15
V, 6 68
VI, 2 21
VII 9 96
VII, 12 59

NAHUM.

I, 3 24
I, 6 96
I, 7 ..... 11, 60
II, 4 15
II, 5 15
II, 8 ..... 48, 128
II, 9 ..... 131, 143
II, 11 120
II, 13 89
II, 14 18
III, 7 81
III, 8 5
III, 10 76
III, 12 134
III, 18 162
III, 19 68
IV, 18 48

HABAKKUK.

I, 4 ..... 53, 63, 91
I, 5 ..... 54, 144
I, 8 ..... 73, 97
I, 9 ..... 81, 99
I, 16 155
II, 11 99

HABAKKUK.

CHAP. PAGE.

II, 12 51
II, 13 ..... 93, 60
II, 16 ..... 61, 102
II, 17 ..... 75, 89
II, 18 11
III, 1 103
III, 5 39
III, 7 12
III, 16 71
III, 17 ..... 17, 71

ZEPHANIAH.

I, 9 68
I, 10 ..... 28, 214
I, 12 122
I, 15, 18 54
I, 18 208
II, 2 ..... 73. 93, 192
II, 6 133
II, 8 90
II, 10 90
II, 14 22
II, 15 134
III, 7 ..... 84, 115
III, 17 19

HAGGAI.

I, 4 45
I, 10 151
II, 15 139
II, 18 139

ZACHARIAH.

I, 3 142
I, 6 32
I, 8 106
I, 17 ..... 78, 129
II, 4 98
II, 6 42
II, 10 52
III. 4 37
III, 7 13
III, 9 22
IV, 7 ..... 36, 133
V, 6 66
VI, 10 ..... 56, 62
VI, 14 56

ZACHARIAH.

CHAP. PAGE.

VI, 15 .....149, 164
VII, 10 159
VIII, 5 170
VIII, 14 101
IX, 6 ..... 27, 139
IX, 8 11
IX, 10 206
X, 1 18
X, 2 ..... 98, 103
X, 6 ..... 113, 132
X, 7 31
X, 8 44
X, 12 83
XI 2 119
XI, 3 36
XI, 8 168
XI, 16 ..... 64, 106
XII, 1 174
XII, 2 24
XII, 6 117
XII, 9* 44
XIII, 1 97
XIII, 6 ..... 117, 162
XIII, 9 ..... 9, 135
XIV, 4 112
XIV, 5 ..... 18, 41
XIV, 9 ..... 38, 90
XIV, 20 ... 85. 109, 183

MALACHI.

I, 4 45
II, 11 159
III, 5 ..... 18, 158
III, 15 ..... 59, 73
III, 16 ..... 24, 46
III, 17 24
III, 19 59
III, 21 123

PSALMS.

I, 1 17
II, 1 182
II, 2 92
II, 3 109
III, 2 ..... 8, 142
III, 3 ..... 63. 166, 168
III, 4* 23*. 49
III, 6 154

PSALMS.

CHAP.	PAGE.
III, 9	83, 154
IV, 3	102
IV, 4	63
V, 3	130
V, 4	130
VII, 2*	90
VII, 6	85
VII, 10	91
VII, 12	162
VII, 15, 17	68
VII, 17	16
VIII, 2	5
VIII, 3	33
VIII, 4	86, 202
VIII, 6	115
VIII, 9	10
IX, 3	20
IX, 4	46
IX, 6	11, 91
IX, 9	169
IX, 16	11
IX, 17, 21	216
IX, 18	41
IX, 19	49
X, 3	112
X, 4	87
X, 6	128
X, 7, 14	68
X, 8	17, 47, 60, 124
X, 9	24, 42, 113, 171
X, 11, 18	216
X, 12	212
X, 15	42
XII, 2	41
XII, 5	48
XII, 8	94
XIII, 3	95, 168
XIII, 6	15
XIV	207
XIV, 1	206
XIV, 3	52
XIV, 4	90
XIV, 6	12
XIV, 7	9
XV, 3	192
XV, 4	123
XVI, 3	20
XVII, 1	57, 183, 215
XVII, 9	29, 124
XVII, 7	84
XVII, 12	47
XVII, 13	106, 186
XVII, 14	40, 186
XVIII	204
XVIII 1	183
XVIII 2	7
XVIII, 12	8
XVIII, 15*	68
XVIII, 22	107
XVIII, 34	155
XVIII, 42	142
XVIII, 45	41
XIX 3	112
XIX, 5	67, 121
XX, 3	181
XX, 6	55
XXI, 2	8
XXI, 3*	37
XXI, 12	44
XXII, 5	170
XXII, 10	124
XXII, 14	141
XXII, 15	42, 110
XXII, 16	47, 92, 123
XXII, 18	42
XXII, 20	214
XXII, 22	8
XXII, 26	67, 123
XXII, 27	55, 162, 175
XXII, 28	18, 67
XXII, 29	154
XXII, 30	113
XXII, 30	168
XXIV, 3	211
XXIV, 5	211
XXVI, 1, 21	164
XXV, 2	127
XXV, 1-21	164
XXV, 2, 5, 22	217
XXV, 3	24
XXV, 9	8, 115
XXV, 19	142
XXVI, 2	217
XXVI, 10	117, 217
XXVII, 1	38, 211
XXVII, 3	20
XXVII, 6	175
XXVII, 12	177
XXVII, 13	177
XXVIII, 1*	38, 61, 84*
XXVIII, 5	78, 206
XXVIII, 7	20
XXVIII, 8	27, 142
XXIX, 7	48
XXIX, 11	27
XXX, 2	74
XXX, 3	108, 21
XXXI, 2	205
XXXI, 3	39, 72, 205
XXXI, 8	59
XXXI, 10	175
XXXI, 11	9
XXXI, 12	17, 57
XXXI, 12	88, 147
XXXI, 13	42
XXXI, 14	175
XXXI, 15	146
XXXI, 19	31
XXXI, 20	55, 142
XXXI, 21	47, 177
XXXI, 22	112
XXXI, 23	20, 115
XXXI, 24	31
XXXII, 3	42
XXXII, 4, 5, 7	85
XXXII, 5	24
XXXII, 6	28, 38, 104 142
XXXII, 7	154
XXXII, 8	176
XXXII, 9	58
XXXIII, 10	121
XXX1V, 3	83
XXX1V, 4	209, 217
XXX1V, 6	69
XXXIV, 6, 7	217
XXXV, 3	21, 97
XXXV, 8	68
XXXV, 11	144, 176
XXXV, 15	13
XXXV, 16	176
XXXV, 21	147
XXXV, 26	147
XXXV, 28	50

PSALMS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XXXVI, 2 13
XXXVI, 6 110
XXXVI, 7 177
XXXVI, 8 112
XXXVI, 10 ..... 39, 138, 172
XXXVI, 12 ... 17, 38, 101
XXXVI, 13 ..... 17, 39
XXXVII, 6 36
XXXVII, 19 47
XXXVII, 23 ..... 52, 135
XXXVII, 28 ... 147, 247
XXXVII, 30* 50
XXXVII, 35 45
XXXVIII, 4 96
XXXVIII, 9 137
XXXVIII, 11 142
XXXVIII, 12 172
XXXVIII, 20 80
XXXIX, 2 ..... 140, 170, 202
XXXIX, 12 ..... 57, 138
XL, 3 111
XL, 4 9
XL, 5 ..... 52, 139
XL, 10 138
XL, 14, 18 205
XL, 16 74
XLI, 3 82
XLI, 4 108
XLI, 9 22
XLI 10 177
XLI, 11 80
XLI, 12 95
XLI, 13 177
XLII, 2, ... 13, 136, 211
XLII, 5 ..... 26, 178
XLII, 9 12
XLII, 10 70
XLII, 12 128
XLIII, 5 124
XLIV, 2 144
XLIV, 3* ... 15, 19, 115 141
XLIV, 4 115
XLIV, 5 69
XLIV, 5* 19*, 126
XLIV, 20 21

PSALMS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XLIV, 27 168
XLV, 5 157
XLV, 13 192
XLV, 22 9
XLVI, 3 ..... 78, 111
XLVII, 5 115
XLVII, 10 225
XLIX, 5 21
XLIX, 22 123
XLIX, 14 ..... 53, 65
XLIX, 15 ... 123, 128, 169
L, 16 147
L, 18 24
LI, 4 210
LI, 10 14
LI, 11 22
LI, 18 ..... 6, 24
LII, 7 ..... 138, 140
LII, 9 ..... 64, 67, 102
LII, 8 24
LII, 11 ..... 22, 178
LII, 12 7
LII, 22 22
LIII, 2 206
LIII, 4 ..... 52, 90
LIII, 4, 5 206
LIII, 6 12
LIII, 7 9
General remarks ... 206
LIV, 5 58
LIV, 7 12
LV, 9 ..... 91, 103
LV, 10 66
LV, 16 116
LV, 19 39
LV, 22 ... 9, 22, 25, 167
LV, 23 23
LVI, 2 102
LVI, 7 ..... 37, 61
LVI, 9 108
LVI, 14 ..... 18, 127
LVII, 2 ..... 80, 103
LVII, 3 ..... 32, 56
LVII, 4 ..... 14, 66
LVII, 7, 14 205
LVII, 9 154
LVIII, 3 114
LVIII, 4 ..... 20, 66

PSALMS.

CHAP. PAGE.

LVIII, 5 12
LVIII, 7 ... 15, 19, 109
LVIII, 10 ..... 32, 94
LIX, 4* 62
LIX, 8 ..... 14, 93
LIX, 9 169
LIX, 10 66
LIX, 11 20
LX, 4 ..... 11, 95
LX, 6 24
LX, 7, 14..... 205
LX, 11 ..... 10, 135
LXI, 8 ..... 57, 105
LXII, 4 ..... 126, 180
LXII, 10 103
LXIII, 2 ..... 88, 100
LXIII, 3 ..... 16, 33, 71
LXIII 8 58
LXIV, 6 108
LXIV, 7 ..... 51, 98
LXIV, 11 83
LXV, 6 ..... 168, 183
LXV, 7 ..... 16, 76
LXVI, 2 108
LXVI, 3* 41
LXVI, 4 23
LXVI, 7 ..... 54, 83
LXVI, 9 138
LXVII, 5* 62*, 75, 184
LXVII, 5 85
LXVIII, 1 208
LXVIII, 2 206
LXVIII, 5 ..... 108, 138 142, 162, 163, 184
LXVIII, 7 .....75, 184
LXVIII, 9 18
LXVIII, 10 ...23, 51, 184
LXVIII, 11 ..... 51, 140
LXVIII, 14 186
LXVIII, 15.....29, 110 141
LXVIII, 17* ... 28, 41*, 75
LXVIII, 18 ... 47, 51, 86
LXVIII, 20 58
LXVIII, 21 88

PSALMS.

CHAP. PAGE.

LXVIII, 22 ..... 83, 122, 123, 146
LXVIII, 28 ..... 72, 97
LXVIII, 31 ..... 46, 91
LXVIII, 32 96
LXVIII, 33 108
LXVIII, 34 66
LXVIII, 35 184
LXVIII, 36 94
LXIX, 5 185
LXIX, 11 40
LXIX, 13 139
LXIX, 14 185
LXIX, 16 97
LXIX, 20 155
LXIX, 27 111
LXIX, 28 ..... 13, 42
LXIX, 33 55
LXIX, 36 45
LXX, 2, 6 205
LXXI, 1, 2 205
LXXI, 3 ..... 19, 39, 60, 72
LXXI, 4 25
LXXI, 6 ..... 16, 61
LXXI, 7 ..... 16, 95
LXXI, 19 128
LXXI, 21 26
LXXII, 3 129
LXXII, 4 129
LXXII, 8 206
LXXII, 9 ..... 81, 213
LXXII, 10 36
LXXII, 14 60
LXXII, 16 123
LXXIII, 1 ..... 127, 166
LXXIII, 2 185
LXXIII, 4 169
LXXIII, 19 ..... 110, 185
LXXIII, 20* 19
LXXIII, 26 88
LXXIV, 1 92
LXXIV, 7 77
LXXIV, 9 6
LXXIV, 10 56
LXXIV, 12 4
LXXIV, 13 63
LXXIV, 19 78

PSALMS.

CHAP. PAGE.

LXXIV, 21 41
LXXV, 6 31
LXXV, 9 ..... 20, 64
LXXV, 10 ..... 55, 212
LXXVI, 3 62
LXXVI, 4 185
LXXVI, 5 ..... 123, 187
LXXVI, 8 ..... 20, 170
LXXVI, 9 78
LXXVI, 11 52
LXXVI, 13 45
LXXVII, 3 178
LXXVII, 5 208
LXXVII, 7 141
LXXVII, 9 ..... 171, 172
LXXVII, 10* ... 122, 214
LXXVII, 18 45
LXXVII, 14 94
LXXVIII, 4 ..... 6, 136
LXXVIII, 9 90
LXXVIII 21 187
LXXVIII, 26 137
LXXVIII, 31 ..... 20, 29, 91, 105
LXXVIII, 34 48
LXXVIII 41* 68
LXXVIII, 47 40
LXXVIII, 52 51
LXXVIII, 57 81
LXXVIII, 59 ... 17, 187
LXXVIII, 61 ..... 16, 81
LXXVIII, 63 ... 61, 187
LXXVIII, 65 ... 97, 187
LXXVIII, 66 ..... 89, 96
LXXVIII, 68 76
LXXVIII, 69 42
LXXIX, 6 13
LXXIX, 6, 7 ... 206, 207
LXXIX, 9 141
LXXIX 10 208
LXXIX, 11 106
LXXX, 2 ..... 49, 50
LXXX, 3 ..... 15, 168
LXXX, 5 ..... 24, 63
LXXX, 6 79
LXXX, 7 ..... 93, 187
LXXX, 16 ..... 15, 100
LXXX, 17 ..... 15, 46, 58

PSALMS.

CHAP. PAGE.

LXXX, 18 47
LXXXI, 6 90
LXXXI, 15 ... 166, 188
LXXXI, 16* 41
LXXXI, 17 ..... 84, 108
LXXXII, 3 118
LXXXII, 5 82
LXXXII, 7 ... 115, 123
LXXXII, 8 154
LXXXIII, 9 36
LXXXIII, 15 193
LXXXIII, 17 46
LXXXIV, 6 90
LXXXV, 7 13
LXXXV, 9 48
LXXXVI, 14 58
LXXXVIII, 2 212
LXXXVIII, 16 52
LXXXIX, 3 10
LXXXIX, 9 57
LXXXIX, 10 76
LXXXIX, 14 213
LXXXIX, 17 ..... 93, 213
LXXXIX, 34 103
LXXXIX, 40 77
LXXXIX, 51 116
XC, 2 129
XC, 3 129
XC, 10..... 65, 141, 180
XC, 12 67
XCI, 4* 76
XCI, 7 81
XCI, 8 ..... 28, 104, 128
XCI, 9 72
XCII, 9 99
XCIV, 4 31
XCIV, 17 80
XCIV, 20 98
XCV, 11 88
XCVI, 13 157
XCVII, 7 9
XCVII, 11 ..... 8, 22, 227
XCVIII, 3 206
XCIX, 1 93
C, 3 11
CI, 5 60
CII, 2 209
CII, 8 54

PSALMS.

CHAP.	PAGE.
CII, 11	96
CIII, 9	111, 112
CIV, 11	184
CIV, 21	106
CV, 3	83
CV, 27	9
CVI, 5	38
CVI, 45	101
CVII, 4	130
CVII, 5	60
CVII, 14*	109
CVII, 25	26
CVII, 29	88
CVII, 39	16
CVIII, 2	108, 154
CVIII, 2, 6	205
CIX, 10	48
CIX, 15	6
CIX, 23	90
CIX, 28	5
CXIII, 4	16, 31
CXIV, 3	209
CXV, 4, 8	205
CXVI, 19	155
CXVII, 1	182
CXVIII, 10	11, 77
CXVIII, 11	77, 157
CXVIII, 12	77
CXVIII, 14	20
CXVIII, 27	55
CXIX, 1	215
CXIX, 2	215
CXIX, 3	215
CXIX, 17	63
CXIX, 111	89
CXIX 117	63
CXIX, 118	85
CXIX, 121	159
CXIX, 122	159
CXXI, 1	134
CXXI, 3	88
CXXIII, 2	211
CXXIV, 1	43
CXXIV, 7	73
CXXVII, 1	210
CXXVII, 2	80
CXXIX, 3	14
CXXXI, 2	24

PSALMS.

CHAP.	PAGE.
CXXXII, 3, 4	88
CXXXV, 7	206, 207
CXXXV, 14	208
CXXXV 15, 20	205
CXXXVI, 13	71
CXXXIX, 16	78
CXL, 9	68
CXLI, 3	138
CXLIII, 6	85
CXLIII, 7*	84
CXLIII, 8	211
CXLIII, 9	84
CXLIV, 2	70, 174
CXLIV, 15*	21
CXLV,	217
General remarks	217
CXLIX, 7	182

PROVERBS.

I, 11	17, 100
I, 26	21, 73
I, 27	21, 73
III, 19	210
III, 20	210
III, 25	21, 73
III, 27	17
III, 32	213
III, 35	73
IV, 3*	15, 54
IV, 14	11
V, 9	57
V, 11	61
VI, 5	144
VI, 11	11
VIII, 12	10
X, 7	101, 211
X, 9	213
X, 12	211
X, 21	10, 44
X, 27	211
X, 31	72
X, 32	40
XI, 4	54
XI, 15	83, 86
XI, 16	27
XI, 26	167
XI, 28	46

PROVERBS.

CHAP.	PAGE.
XII, 6	17
XII, 13	97
XII, 21	137
XII, 26	30
XIII, 1	141
XIII, 3	173
XIII, 7	81
XIII, 12	137
XIII, 13	173
XIII, 18	8
XIII, 20	66
XIII, 21	51
XIV, 7	83
XIV, 15	21, 73
XIV, 18	24
XIV, 23	53
XIV, 31	159
XV, 5	23
XV, 8	211
XV, 33	59
XVI, 16	154
XVI, 30	64
XVII, 1	19, 178
XVII, 11	84
XVII, 13	112
XVII, 22	60
XVII, 25	26
XVII, 26	44
XVIII,, 3	4
XVIII, 19*	46
XIX, 12	96
XIX, 20	15
XIX, 27	78
XIX, 28*	79
XIX, 29	15
XX, 2	12
XX, 16	34
XXI, 4	17, 60
XXI, 6	101
XXI, 11	151
XXI, 20	79
XXII, 5	99
XXII, 7	156
XXII, 8	13
XXII, 12	59
XXII, 16	159
XXIII, 5	64
XXIV, 2	36, 68

PROVERBS.

CHAP. PAGE.

XXIV, 34 11
XXV, 8 15
XXV, 19 132
XXV, 27 55
XXVII, 7 20
XXVII, 13 124
XXVII, 25* 61
XXVIII, 2 142
XXVIII, 12* 20
XXVIII, 18 38
XXVIII 19* 8
XXVIII, 25 ... 17, 54, 60
XXVIII, 26 212
XXIX, 2 40
XXIX, 6 ..... 30, 100
XXIX, 11 76
XXX, 8 8
XXX, 9 65
XXXI, 10 21
XXXI, 16 74

JOB.

I, 1 155
I, 11 145
I, 17 77
I, 19 47
II, 10 12
IV, 8 68
IV, 10 104
IV, 12 28
IV, 18 63
V, 2 26
V, 23 40
V, 22, 29, 24, 31 ... 29
VI, 2 26
VI, 8 38
VIII, 9 168
VIII, 17 70
IX, 12 24
IX, 17 26
IX, 26 ..... 73, 108
XI, 12 55
XII, 7 145
XIV, 10 108
XV, 23 46
XV, 25* 28
XV, 35 68
XVI, 18 97

JOB.

CHAP. PAGE.

XVI, 22 155
XVII, 1 16
XVII, 6 15
XIX, 8 30
XIX, 22 10
XIX, 27 135
XX, 17 160
XXI, 7 31
XXI, 20 ... 64, 86, 102
XXIII, 12 ..... 63, 132
XXIV, 14 ..... 127, 166
XXVII 4 50
XXVII, 8 8
XXVIII, 13 57
XXVIII, 16 72
XXVIII, 18 20
XXIX, 4 55
XXXIV, 11 168
XXXIV, 20 30
XXXVIII, 28 210
XXXIX, 9 8
XXXIX, 10 8
XXXIX, 29 111
XLI, 8 105
XLV, 10 72

CANTICLES.

I, 7 86
I, 12 26
I, 17 30
II, 11 108
VII, 3 20
VIII, 2 51

RUTH.

I, 5 135
I, 12 ..... 83, 120
II, 15 37
III, 11 119
III, 14 153
III, 17 144
IV, 5 ..... 10, 49

LAMENTATIONS.

I, 15 85
I, 16 157
II, 2 15
III, 16 15

LAMENTATIONS.

CHAP. PAGE.

III, 24 210
III, 28 10
III, 45 ..... 57, 17
III, 59 65
III, 63 141
IV, 4 26
IV, 13 225
IV, 19 175

ECCLESIASTES.

I, 17 26
II, 19 68
II, 19 68
IV, 14 141
VI, 2 25
VII, 19 138
VII, 25 26
VII, 27 126
VIII, 14 192
X, 1, 13 26
XII, 8 126

ESTHER.

I, 8 196

DANIEL.

I, 11 197
II, 35* 28
II, 39 28
III, 31 28
VII, 9 28
VIII, 4 196
X, 5 72

EZRA.

II, 2 100
IV, 5 26
VIII, 29 89
X, 6 89

NEHEMIAH.

III, 30 89
V, 2 140
V, 11 139
VII, 7 100
X, 38, 39 89
XII, 44 89
XIII, 5 89
XIII, 7 89

1st. CHRONICLES.

CHAP.	PAGE.
IV, 40	193
VI, 16	148
VI, 43	204
VI, 45	204
IX, 12	197
IX, 17	197
IX, 18	197
IX, 26, 33	89
IX, 29	197
IX, 35	157, 197
X, 9	35
XI, 37	99
XVI, 43	26
XVII, 6	15
XVII, 21	152
XVII, 22	88
XIX, 15	46
XIX, 16	14

1st. CHRONICLES.

CHAP.	PAGE.
XXIV, 12	105
XXVII, 1 F. N.	15
XXIX, 23	192

2nd. CHRONICLES.

IV, 11, 16	85
XI, 18	102
XII, 16	62
XIII, 12	183
XIV, 14	179
XV, 3	151
XVI, 8	151
XVI, 9	126
XVI 10	96
XXI, 2	174
XXIV, 24	151
XXV, 8	123
XXV, 19	84

2nd. CHRONICLES.

XXVIII, 9	86
XXVIII, 19	174
XXIX, 21	8
XXX, 15	37
XXXII, 1, 33	207
XXXIV, 22	144
XXXV, 21	145

MATTHEW.

XIX, 5	148

MARK.

X, 8	148

EPHESIANS.

V, 31	148

REVELATION.

XVI, 19	14

EMENDATION OF THE MASSORETIC TEXT

of the

OLD TESTAMENT.

PRINCIPLES of CRITICISM.

ERRATA

Corrections.

Page	Line	Instead of	Should read
9	30	Ex. 8/70	Ex. 8/20
13	5	אפְרִים	אֶפְרַיִם
13	15	Jer. 10/1, 25/15	Jer. 10/2, 20/6 cannot be traced.
14	7	גַּוֵּהַ	גֵּוֵהַ
14	16	Νεβὲωδ	Νεβρὼδ
15	9	Prov. 4/5	Prov. 4/3
15	14	"Body"	Strength.
15	18	Jud. 6/28	Jud. 6/25
15	20	Ps. 44/2	Ps. 44/3
15	26	as in Ps. 80/16	but in Ps. 80/16
16	13	ἐγγιοῦσι	ἐγγιοῦσιν
16	20	evinguished	extinguished
16	30	Footnote. Instead of 'If'	'In'
17	10	Isa. 3/13	Isa. 3/12
17	15	Micha 1/7	Micha 1/9
18	16	ἐφ	εφ
19	9	Psalm 44/15	Ps. 44/5
19	22	Ps. 75/19	Ps. 73/20
20	18, 19	Delate, as inexact.	
20	25	Psalm 28/12	Proverbs 28/12
21	6 up from Foot	Ps. 114/15	Psalms 144/15
22	11	Isa. 39/12	Isa. 39/2
23	9	Isa. 1/27	Isa. 1/28

Page	Line	Instead of	Should read
23	10	Delate 'of.'	
23	4 up from Foot		
		Isa. 3/4	Isa. 3/24
23	2 up from Foot		
		Job. 13/25	Job. 15/25
24	5 up from Foot		
		Jer. 3/19	Jer. 3/9
24	2 up from Foot		
		II Sam. 13/13	I. Sam. 13/14
26	3	Example stated I. Sam 12/13	Queried
27	3	Isa. 37/20	Isa. 37/30
27	5	Num. 15/89	Num. 15/89
28	3	Dan. 2/36	Dan. 2/35
28	6	Sam. 21/7	Sam. 21/8
28	Last line	ἐαύ	ἐάν
29	First line	accent on ὗ	
33	5	ὗια	κιᾶ
33	9	Ezek. 34/30	Ezek. 34/29
33	20	This passage is repeated from previous page 32	
34	5	(17/11, 11/46 in English)	(16/47, 17/11 in English)
34	6	Isa. 51/1	Isa. 55/1
35	19	I. Chr 11/9	I. Chr. 10/9
36	20	'and they bring forth'	and bring forth.
37	5	Ps. 20/3	Ps. 21/3
38	25	νηστειον	νηστεῖαν
39	5	Delate 'a'.	
39	6	Comparison	Confusion
39	8	וַיִּצֶר	וַיִּצֶר
39	28	Γεδ	Γεο
40	26	מֵחֶלְזוֹ	מֵחֶלְדוֹ
41	10	Ps. 63/3	Ps. 66/3
41	11	Ps. 81/15	Ps. 81/16
41	14	Ps. 68/10	Ps. 68/17
42	9	Verse 7	Verse 9
42	15	ἐν εῇ γῇ	ἐν τῇ γῇ
43	3	This is not the case, the LXX supports the M.T. Reading	
43	4	Jon. 1/17	Jon. 1/7
43	16	Jer. 41/16	Jer. 42/16
44	24	Zach. 10/8	Zach. 12/8
44	26	Zach. 12/8	Zach. 12/9

Page	Line	Instead of	Should read
46	7 up from Foot		
		Prov. 18/9	Prov. 18/19
48	11	'the same word'.	
50	6	Ps. 37/20	Ps. 37/30
50	28	ג and ה	ג and ח
54	2	LXX 21—12	LXX 21/13
56	19	Jud. 6/15	Jud. 6/5
59	10	Prov. 15/23	Prov. 15/33
59	17	Amos	Amos 1/11
60	13	Jer. 3/24	Jer. 2/24
61	3	Prov. 27/6	Prov. 27/25
61	15	II. Sam. 1/18	II. Sam. 1/19
62	8	Gen. 18/20	Gen. 18/21
62	10	Ps. 59/2	Ps. 59/4
62	19	I. Sam. 9/21	I. Sam. 9/19
62	29	Ps. 76/3	Ps. 67/5
64	27	Isa. 40/20	Isa. 40/21
64	33	Deut 5/18	Deut. 5/28
66	13	M. T.	'Some versions'
66	22	Greek Tr. 57/4	57/3
66	25	Dyserrick	Dyserinck
68	7	Ps. 78/4	Ps. 78/41
68	12	II. Sam. 12/15	II. Sam. 22/15
68	12	Ps. 18/5	Ps. 18/15
69	2	Isa. 5/10	Isa. 5/18
69	12	Amos. 5/11	Amos 6/11
72	22	Jer. 19/9	Jer. 10/9
72	25	Num. 11/13	Num. 10/9
75	12	Ps. 57/5	Ps. 67/5
76	4	Ναβωθ	Ναβαι
76	6	Ps. 91/8	Ps. 91/4
77	13	ἄνων	ἡμῶν
77	17	Amos 9/10	Amos 8/10
77	20	Ps. 9/20	Entered by Mistake
79	15	Num. 25/4	Num. 25/6
79	19	Ps. 19/28	Prov. 19/28
79	20	Frankerberg	Frankenberg
81	3	in 4/4	Isa. 4/4
81	29	τις εχθρὸν	εις εχθρόν
82	15	Ex. 25/3	Ex. 25/39

Page	Line	Instead of	Should read
82	17	Ex. 22/6	Ex. 22/5
84	4	Ez. 33/22	Ex. 33/22
84	9	Ps. 28/11	Ps. 28/1
84	10	143/9	143/7
85	28, 29	In 1 Sam etc. down to the word Fire	Entered by mistake
88	24	כְּמָה	כָּמַה
89	1	נָהַלְתָּ	גָּהַלְתָּ
89	26	וּמְנַתֵּק	וּמְחַגֵּק
90	16	Ps. 6/2	Ps. 7/2
91	1	ang	and
91	10	בְּעֵר	גְּעֵר
91	21	Ezak. 19/7	Ezek. 19/7
92	8	Gen. 49/19	Gen. 49/29
93	33	Line 33 repeated as already printed : See line 30 same page	
94	32	1. Kings 20/42	1. Kings 20/43
97	Last line	תְּאַסֵּר	תְּאַטֵּר
105	19	Job 41/9	Job. 41/6
109	12	לַחֵלֵק	לַחֲלֵץ
109	20	Ps. 2/3, 107/143	Ps. 2/3, 107/14
110	8	'openly'	'Properly'
110	2 up from Foot	Num. 22/15	Ps. 22/15
111	4	Ps. 60/3	Ps. 46/3
111	19	out	Ought
111	29	Ps. 103/9	See next page
112	23	יְתֵק	יְתֵת
112	24	Ἰεττεϱ	Ἰεθεϱ
115	18	Ps. 47/4	Ps. 47/5
118	4	Gen. 41/15	Gen. 41/51
122	24	Dyserrick	Dyserinck
122	24	Ps. 77/8	Ps. 77/11
122	27	Deut. 25/9	Deut. 25/19
123	17	Entered by mistake	See Ps. 64/7 P 98
123	19	Ex. 32/12	Ex. 33/12
125	6	Isa. 22/9	Isa. 22/8
130	24, 27		Double Entry
133	21	Gen. 32/33	Gen. 32/23
134	1	partiele	particle

Page	Line	Instead of	Should read
136	16	Jerusalem	Jeroboam
136	16	הַחִטִי	הַחִטִיא
138	4	revelant	relevant
139	4 up from Foot		
		Ps. 60/5	Ps. 40/5
141	8	גַּז	גָּז
141	13	Ref. Isa. 2/16	Can not trace
141	18	Θξοε	Θεος
143	26	Jer. 31/17	Jer. 31/37
144	5	ξώρω	δώσω
144	19	תָּבֹא	תָּבוֹאִי
146	2	η θε χαλαξα	βέ η χαλαξα
146	Footnote	Page 165	Page 166
147	6	Isa. 7/2	Isa. 7/1
147	2 up from Foot		
		salso	also
148	23	Verse 32	verse 12
148	20	I Chr. 6/16	I Cor. 6/16
151	3	Jer. 30/20, 25	Jer. 33/20, 35
151	15	II Chr. 16/8, 22/24	II Chr. 16/8, 24/24
152	4	Amos 9/3	Amos 9/3, 4
152	23	Sam. 7/2	Sam. 7/23
153	14	- - -	is.
154	4	Ps. 57/8	Ps. 57/9
154	8	Jud. 15/19	Josh. 15/18
154	Last line	בְּרִיאָה	בְּרֵאָה
157	4	Num. 17/29	Num. 17/28
157	11	'thy brethen'	In Ezek. 11/55
157	27	Lev. 14/8	Lev. 14/6
160	28	Josh. 6/7	Josh. 6/1
162	31	χερσι	χερσιν
164	4	'Behold, I will feed them (this people)'	This ref. cannot be traced
166		F. N.	Page 146
193	8	κληρονοκήσουσιν	κληρονομήσουσιν

M. L.

1st June, 1928.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

441171

BS
1185
K5

Kennedy, James, *d.* 1925.
An aid to the textual amendment of the Old Testament, by James Kennedy, D. D., edited by N. Levison, B. D. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1928.

ix, 255 p. fold. tab. 22 cm.

441171

1. Bible. O. T.—Criticism, Textual. 2. Masorah. I. Levison, Nahum, 1888– ed. II. Title.

BS1185.K4 CCSC/jc 29—22163

Library of Congress [a63e½]